DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 550 UD 013 541

TITLE	Final Report of an Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Programs, Community School District 1, Board of Education of the City of New York.
INSTITUTION	Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	133p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Cross Age Teaching; Day Camp Programs; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Diagnosis; Federal Programs; Mentally Handicapped; Perceptually Handicapped; *Program Evaluation; Recreational Programs; Retarded Children; *Summer Programs; Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of the Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965 programs of New York City Community School District I, reviews six programs, as follows: (1) Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten program, Early Childhood Pre-School Summer Headstart, serving children who have never attended school and who will attend kindergarten or some who are now in kindergarten; (2) Identification and Treatment of Perceptual Difficulties, designed to serve 30 kindergarten children identified as high "risks" and to offer diagnostic service to 50 elementary school students; (3) Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development, a continued summer program for 70 children; (4) 1972 Summer Day Elementary School Program, designed to provide remedial instruction to approximately 480 children, including a small number of non-public students; (5) Summer 1972 Homework Helper program, in which 26 college tutors and 200 high school and junior high school tutors worked with nearly 600 elementary school students with the objectives of raising the reading level and educational aspirations of the tutored students and assisting 80 percent of the tutors in staying in school; and, (6) Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program, a comprehensive educationally oriented recreation program.
(Author/JM)

ED 075550

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function Nos. 33-3-1604
33-3-1605
33-3-1606
33-3-1607
33-3-1608
33-3-1609

FINAL REPORT

AN EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT I

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Early Childhood Pre-School Program

Identification and Treatment of Perceptual Difficulties

Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development

Summer Day Elementary School Program

Homework Helper Program

Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program

An evaluation of a New York School District education project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer of 1972.

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP.

91-31 Queens Boulevard/ Suite 611/ Elmhurst, New York, N.Y. 11373/ 212-478-4340

UD 013541

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Early Childhood Pre-School Program		
I.	Objectives of the Program	1
II.	Program Activities	1
III.	Evaluation	8
IV.	Program Observer's Report	9
V.	Presentation of the Data and Results	13
VI.	Recommendations of Project Observer and Evaluator	28
Appendix A	Growth and Development Checklist	31
Appendix B	Parent Questionnaire (Spanish)	34
Appendix C	Parent Questionnaire (English)	36
Appendix D	School Codes	37
Identification and Treatment of Perceptual Difficulties		
I.	Program Description	40
II.	Teaching and Diagnostic Technique	40
III.	Evaluation Design	40
IV.	Findings	40
V.	Discussion	42
VI.	Conclusions and Recommendations	43
Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development		
I.	Program Description	46
II.	Program Objectives	52
III.	Evaluation Procedures	53
IV.	Findings	55
V.	Summary and Recommendations	60
Summer Day Elementary School Program		
I.	Program Description	63
II.	Program Objectives	65
III.	Evaluation Objectives	65
IV.	Methods and Procedures	66
V.	Results of the Evaluation	67
VI.	Conclusions and Recommendations	80
Appendix A	Questionnaire	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Homework Helper Program		
I.	Introduction	86
II.	History of the Homework Helper Program	86
III.	Evaluation Design	91
IV.	Results	92
V.	Summary	95
Appendix A	Tutor Questionnaire	96
Appendix B	Student Questionnaire	97
Appendix C	Bibliography	99
Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program		
I.	Program Description	104
II.	Program Objectives	109
III.	Evaluation Objectives	109
IV.	Methods and Procedures	109
V.	Findings	110
VI.	Conclusions	117
VII.	Recommendations	118
Appendix A	"My School" Questionnaire	120
Appendix B	Parent Questionnaire #1	121
Appendix C	Parent Questionnaire #2	123
Appendix D	Oral Language Skills Evaluation	125
Appendix E	Written Language Skills Evaluation	126

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Early Childhood Pre-School Program

Table 1.	Growth and Development Checklist: School A	17
Table 2.	Growth and Development Checklist: School B	18
Table 3.	Growth and Development Checklist: School C	19
Table 4.	Growth and Development Checklist: School D	20
Table 5.	Growth and Development Checklist: School E	21
Table 6.	Growth and Development Checklist: School F	22
Table 7.	Growth and Development Checklist: School G	23
Table 8.	Growth and Development Checklist: School H	24
Table 9.	Parent Questionnaire	26

Identification and Treatment of Perceptual Difficulties

Table 1.	Means and Statistical Tests of Scores on the Search Battery	41
Table 2.	Mean Search Battery Score Changes During the Summer 1972 and 1971 - 1972 School Year	41

Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development

Table 1.	Distribution of Children According to Class and School	47
Table 2.	Distribution of Physical Handicaps for Class at P.S. 137	48
Table 3.	Class Schedule for all Groups at P.S. 19	49
Table 4.	Schedule of Field Trips	50
Table 5.	Class Schedule at P.S. 137	51
Table 6.	Means, Standard Deviations and Significance of Differences on Pre and Post Tests	59

Summer Day Elementary School Program

Table 1.	Relative Frequencies According to Home Schools of Students in SDES Program - P.S. 137	64
Table 2.	Relative Frequencies According to Home Schools of Students in SDES Program - P.S. 20	64
Table 3.	Ethnic Distribution in District 1 as Compared to Ethnic Distributions in Two SDES Schools	65
Table 4.	Summary of Attendance Data of SDES Program	73
Table 5.	Students of SDES Improving .2 Grade Equivalents in Reading	74
Table 6.	Distribution of Average Change and Pre-Post Reading Scores by Grade Level for Each SDES School	75
Table 7.	Students of SDES Improving .2 Grade Equivalents in Mathematics	76

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Summer Day Elementary School Program Continued

Table 8. Distribution of Average Change and Pre-Post Mathematics Scores by Grade Level for Both SDES Schools 77

Table 9. Percentages of Teachers in SDES Program Evaluating the Program as Generally Effective or Extremely Effective in Various Components 79

Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program

Table 1. Home School of Students Attending Two Vacation Day Camp Centers 106

Table 2. Grade Level Distribution of Students Attending VDC 71 107

Table 3. Ethnic Distribution of Each VDC Center as Compared to Regular School Distribution 108

Table 4. Scheduled Bus Trips for the Two VDC Centers 112

Table 5. 't' test - "My School" Questionnaire - Pre-Post Differences 113

Table 6. 't' test - "My School" Questionnaire - Pre-Post Differences at VDC 63 113

Table 7. 't' test - "My School" Questionnaire - Pre-Post Differences at VDC 71 114

Table 8. 't' test - Parent Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School - Pre-Post Differences 114

Table 9. 't' test - Parent Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School - Pre Post Differences 115

Table 10. 't' test - Parent Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School - Pre-Post Differences 115

Table 11. Parent Responses to Different Aspects of the VDC for Each Center - Yes Responses 116

Table 12. 't' test - Oral and Written Skills Evaluation for VDC 63 - Pre-Post Measures 117

Function No. 33-3-1604

EARLY CHILDHOOD PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR:	LOUIS J. HOFMANN, PH.D.
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS:	JULIAN ROBERTS, PH.D.
	LORNA DUPHINEY EDMUNDSON

TITLE I ESEA PROGRAMS - DISTRICT 1

Summer 1972

HEADSTART

I. Objectives of the Program

Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten

1. The Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten program, Early Childhood Pre-School Summer Headstart will serve children who have never attended school and who will attend kindergarten or some who are now in kindergarten. It is expected that 75% of the children in the program will improve their skills in learning school routines, reading readiness skills and skills in social behavior.

2. The parents of 75% of the children in the Headstart program will atend at least one school function. Those who attend should have a more positive attitude toward school and home relations.

II. Program Activities: The program activities were based on the following needs identified by a District Title I advisory council:

1. To expose at an early stage awareness of the printed word and a readiness for reading through a wide variety of materials.

2. To foster verbal, conceptual and cognitive development in aural-oral storytelling sessions.

3. To promote greater parental involvement in the educative process by involving parents in consultation groups and to articulate their ideas in the learning program.

4. To help children perfect the senses of sight and touch and obtain firsthand experimentation with mateirals and equipment.

5. To provide a program for identification and treatment of selected kindergarten children who show evidence of perceptual difficulties.

A. DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

The Title I district office is located at 80 Montgomery Street, New York, New York 10002. It serves the entire district's Title I programs and is the resource unit for the community. The district office will be open from July 1 to August 31, 1972, to cover the entire period of administration.

The functions of the District Title I Coordinator are as follows: (1) as head of the Title I office coordinates the overall organization and administration of Title I programs and, under the community Superintendent, assists in the supervision of those programs; (2) serves as resource person as well as liaison between the District Office and the Board of Education, the Community School Board, community agencies and other interested community groups in matters relating to Title I; (3) maintains all records relating to Title I program development and expenditures of funds, and serves on committees of district professional personnel and community representatives in the development of suggestions for programs, securing consensus on programs to be implemented in District 1; (4) participates in the writing of proposals in accordance with guidelines set forth by the State Education Department and the Federal guidelines; (5) prepares summaries and reports and is responsible for the development of budgets concerned with District and Title I ESEA programs; (6) attends and participates in Title I meetings and conferences at the district, city and state levels; (7) aids applicants in the mechanics of writing and budgeting their proposals; (8) assists the Superintendent in guiding the project Coordinators in implementation of their programs.

Administration requires the services of a summer school secretary to work from 9-1, 4 hours daily, July 1 to August 15, 1972. The secretary will prepare materials and reports, keep imprest funds records, type correspondence, act as a receptionist and perform other duties prescribed by the Coordinator.

A clerk/typist is needed to assist in such clerical functions as mail, processing of supply requisitions, maintaining the files, and other related activities. The summer clerk/typist will work from 9-5, 7 hours daily from July 1 to August 31, 1972.

B. EARLY CHILDHOOD PRE-SCHOOL PROGRAM SUMMER HEADSTART 1972

The Early Childhood Pre-School Program Summer Headstart 1972 will be for children in District 1, Manhattan, who meet the criteria as

set up in ESEA Title I. It will commence on July 5 and terminate on August 15, 1972, for a total of 25 sessions. All personnel except the school secretaries in the 7 centers will work for 5 hours from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. daily with a prescribed uncompensated lunch hour. The center secretaries will work 3 hours daily from 9-12, for a total of 25 sessions from July 5 to August 8. The district secretary will work 5 hours daily from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. for a total of 25 sessions. A licensed teacher will be in attendance in classroom at all times as prescribed by Board of Education regulations.

1. Program Sites

The target population shall consist of eligible district children. The center for this program will be located in the following schools:

P.S. 15 - 5 classes
P.S. 19 - 3 classes
P.S. 61 - 5 classes
P.S. 63 - 5 classes
P.S. 134 - 4 classes
P.S. 140 - 3 classes
P.S. 188 - 3 classes

This totals 28 classes. The classes will consist of 20 pupils each for a total of 560 children. The program will be designed to meet the needs of two groups of children:

a. Children who will be entering the Kindergarten in September 1972 without previous school experience. This group will make up the larger population of the program.

b. Those children now in the Pre-Kindergarten or Kindergarten program who at the recommendation of their teachers are in need of continued schooling

Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten classrooms will be made available in each school. Additional rooms that will be needed are:

a. Parents' Rooms
b. Auxiliary Room (Aides, Teachers, etc.)
c. Baby-sitting Room
d. Curriculum Coordinator
e. Lunch Room
f. Teachers' Room (2 Lavatories - 1 M, 1 F)
g. Children's Lavatories (1 M, 1 F)
h. General Office

These rooms must be available in each Headstart center. Office machines, telephones, typewriters, rexograph machines, etc., will be available to the Pre-Kindergarten staff for use in the Headstart Program. The Early Childhood Supervisor will contact the various Principals in advance of launching the program to insure access to these needed facilities.

The program for the children will provide experiences designed to provide intellectual growth, language development and firsthand experiences with a wide variety of materials and equipment. In each classroom there will be, in addition to the teacher, one Educational Assistant or 1 Teacher Aide (to insure individuality of instruction as they work with small groups, and individual children). This personnel will assist the teacher with classroom arrangement, preparation of materials and all other activities connected with efficient conduct of the classroom.

Staff Pattern on the District Level will be as follows:

1 District Early Childhood Supervisor who will be the Teacher-in-Charge of the project

1 Curriculum Assistant

1 Parent Program Activity Assistant

1 School Secretary

Personnel for each center will be as follows:

1 Head Teacher for each center for a total of 7

1 Teacher for each class for a total of 28

1 Secretary for each center for a total of 7

1 Family Assistant for each center for a total of 7

1 Educational Assistant or Teacher Aide for each class for a total of 28

1 Family Worker for each class for a total of 28

2. Staff

a. Early Childhood Supervisor

The Early Childhood Supervisor who is the Teacher-in-Charge of the program will be responsible for the administration and active supervision of the program in all the centers in District 1. The Supervisor will meet with members of her staff at regular intervals to note progress, to make recommendations and offer guidance where needed. She will be responsible for coordinating the program in accordance with the prescribed objectives. She will render an internal evaluation of her project at its termination to the District Title I office which will be collated with all project coordinator reports.

b. Curriculum Assistant

One Curriculum Assistant will be assigned to the District Staff to work with the Teacher-in-Charge. She will also assist staff members with curriculum, preparation, planning, developing curriculum and aiding in the implementation of the program as a whole.

c. 28 Classroom Teachers

The 28 Classroom Teachers will be responsible for the programs in the classrooms. They will plan with their Teacher Aides or Educational Assistants for participation in the educational programs as well as room arrangement, preparation of materials, meeting needs of individual children, the safety of the children in the classroom and on trips, meeting and conferring with parents, and the other demands made on the teacher in helping to conduct an effective classroom program.

d. 28 Teacher Aides or Educational Assistants

The Teacher Aides and Educational Assistants will also work closely and directly with the classroom teacher. In assisting her to run the classroom program efficiently and smoothly, they will anticipate and be alert to the children's needs. They will become

involved in teacher's plans and parent involvement activities.

e. Secretary

The secretary assigned to the Early Childhood Program District Office will be responsible for the overall clerical needs and demands of the office as well as for collection of payroll and time sheets for the office staff. In addition, she will type, make stencils, rexograph materials and fulfull the needs of the District Staff. She will also be responsible under the direction of the Teacher-in-Charge for the handling and processing of the Title I related functions such as the processing of requisitions and imprest fund accounting.

Secretaries assigned to the Centers will be responsible for the maintaining of time cards and time sheets; be responsible for "on time" delivery of same to the District Office. Secretaries will type, make stencils, rexograph materials and fulfill the needs of the Center Staff, including the family component and teaching staff for materials to be mailed that have to do with the smooth conduct of the Center.

f. Parent Program Assistant

The Parent Program Assistant is directly responsible to the Teacher-in-Charge to assist with the implementation and enrichment of the Parent Involvement Program including the Parent Advisory structure. She will assist the Family Assistants and Family Workers in each center and aid in the development of activities reflecting the interests and concerns of the parents.

g. Family Assistant

The Family Assistant will work with families and the other members of the team to serve as liaison between family and school and to meet the immediate family needs by referrals through the Teacher-in-Charge and the Head Teacher.

h. Family Worker

The Family Worker is a part of the Parent Activity team and will provide the following services: recruitment of children from hard core families; escort services to and from school when needed; daily follow-up of attendance, and the like.

i. Medical Staff

The Dental Hygienist and the School Health Nurse will service the children. These positions will not be borne by the program.

3. Further Activities

Non-public schools were advised of the program through the Non-Public School representative on the District Advisory Council. In accordance with State and Federal guidelines, non-public school children will be encouraged to participate in the program.

Bus trips to places of interest and meaning for the children will be arranged. By providing new scenes the trips will broaden horizons and work to increase language skill and to develop social awareness. There will be two short bus trips per center to points of interest within a half hour distance from the center. Bus trips can include the following places: Staten Island, Clove Lake Park, Fire Museum, Brooklyn Aquarium, Bronx Zoo or Central Park Zoo. The choice will be determined by the teacher and the parents depending upon availability of buses and other factors. The 2 bus trips are generally made during the second and fourth week of the program.

The program will reduce racial and social isolation by preparing the children for school readiness and reducing the language barriers through exposing the children early to instruction in English.

This program will reduce social and cultural isolation by bringing together children and adults of varying economic, racial and religious backgrounds who with professional guidance, strive to improve interpersonal relationships.

The program budget will provide for postage, office supplies for the schools, telephones, carfare for the staff, classroom supplies and instructional materials. There will be, in addition, a Parent Activity Fund for each class. This fund will be used by the parents in the program for trip expenses and carfare. Lunch and snacks will be provided for the pupils through the Bureau of School Lunches. Parents will be provided with lunches in the program. They will eat with the children and will be involved in the planning and activities. In addition, special foods will be provided for pupils to increase their exposure to foods outside of their own limited experiences. The paraprofessionals who eat with the children will provide a learning situation and social experience for them. Custodial fees will be necessary for P.S. 61.

C. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

A mimeographed or printed circular, describing this summer's program, will be distributed to all public and non-public schools in the district so that eligible pupils may have an opportunity to participate. A memorandum will be sent to all principals and major community agencies to announce the programs. Schools will be encouraged to post notices on the bulletin boards and to make public announcements.

The District Newsletter will also contain the announcements for dissemination by professional staff to district pupils. The Parent Association meetings will be utilized as well as all available council meetings. Project coordinators will also be directed to disseminate information on these programs.

III. Evaluation

A. An instrument (checklist) composed of instructional objectives which represented some of the simple skills expected of the retarded was devised. While not inclusive, it represented a sample of objectives. To complete the instrument for each pupil would take about fifteen minutes.

B. Points brought up in a conversation with Fran Nolan of the Early Childhood Division and with the Early Childhood Supervisor led to the revision of the original checklist. Items were made more specific and less ambiguous. (See Appendix A - Growth and Development Checklist.) The analysis conducted focused on the percentage change in

"not acquired" category over the period of the program. The "unknown" category will of course decrease over the duration of the program. The "unknown" category will be allocated proportionately to the "has acquired" and "has not acquired" categories equal to their population proportion. A statistically significant increase in the proportions of "has acquired" over time will constitute one indicator of the success of the program.

C. The two major evaluation objectives of the Headstart Program are:

1. To determine whether 75% of the children in the program improved their skills in learning school routines, reading readiness, and social behavior.

2. To determine whether the parents of 75% of the children in the program attended at least one school function and whether 80% of those who did attend viewed their experience as improving school-home relations. (See Appendix B - Headstart Parents Questionnaire.)

IV. Program Observer's Report

1. Deviations from the proposal:

Proposed	Actual
$60 per class proposed for Parent Activities	$20 allocated per class
5 days of hot lunches proposed	2 days provided
20 children per class proposed	First week of program children were still being recruited
July 5 - August 15 proposed as length of program	Ran from July 5 - August 8
7 sites proposed with 28 classes	9 sites operated with 30 classes

School by school deviations in number of classes:

Public school #	15	19	61	63	134	140	188	20	64
Actual #classes	5	3	5	3	4	3	3	1	3
Proposed #classes	5	3	5	5	4	3	3	0	0

4 persons at the District staff level proposed	3 were actually there; no curriculum assistant

2. Program Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths	Weaknesses

a. Funding

$50 per class for special foods which teacher and children prepared.	Funding came through in late June. Staff hired at end of June. Children recruited during July 5-9. Coordinator had to rush out and buy materials at retail prices (some at discount).

b. Materials

1. List

magnastiks
shape-up
Tree form Posts
Rig-a-Jig
Alpha Blocks
Landscape Peg set
Blockraft
Stacking elephants
Tinkertoy
Multi fit
Lotto
animal puzzle
Space wheels
Pickup Sticks
Candyland
Playschool Skaneatiles
Sky High
Fit-a-Space
classification game
Play panels
construction rods
Instructo
Montessori alphabet
alphabet and spelling board
Transport spielsatz
Free form postals
fraction squares
Gear circus

(Note: The materials above are simply being listed; no evaluation is intended.)

2. Materials were of excellent quality - mostly manipulative ones which teachers found excellent.

3. For the first time Head-Start is re-collecting materials and storing them for next year rather than leaving them in regular classrooms

Strengths	Weaknesses
c. Time structure	
	1. Nearly all staff agreed 5 weeks is too short.
	2. Most staff felt rather than having the children there from 9 to 3, they should come from 9-2 or 2:30.
	3. Staff agreed that the last half-hour or hour should be free for planning.
	4. Major weakness was no time to plan.
d. Staff	
1. Qualifications	
a. Most staff members were well qualified and had experience with Headstart. This was especially true of the Head Teachers.	
b. Coordinator for district was energetic, resourceful.	
c. Most of the staffs had worked together before and got along well. And most staffs were working in the same school where they taught in winter so that there was much cooperation.	
2. Staff inservice training	
	There was no orientation at all for new teachers and little opportunity for inservice training during the summer unless staffs met with the Head Teacher at lunch. This was not often done.
	Needed a curriculum coordinator.

Strengths	Weaknesses

e. Education Component

1. Quality relatively high if the standard is a traditional nursery school program. Emphasis on new experiences, getting used to school, cooperating.
2. Sense of affective social development is high.
3. Most classrooms warm and supportive with a few exceptions, where it is obvious the teachers would rather be elsewhere.
4. Attempts made to carry over gains and to communicate with first grade teachers.

1. Little program uniformity or sense of goals, strategies, evaluation, etc.
2. Awareness of cognitive development is rather low except in instances where staff is extremely qualified. Most of staff doesn't exhibit familiarity with theory of cognitive development.
3. Four or 5 classes didn't get into operation until the second week of the program.

f. Parent Component

1. Response seemed good to efforts to bring parents into the school to express their feelings about the programs.
2. Breakfast held for parents in each school was well attended.
3. Parent trips were well attended.
4. Many parents feel the program offers them a great deal.

1. Goal of developing good school/home relationship may be a little limited considering the project has been in operation since 1965.
2. Focus of parents' role in educating child not clear in the program.
3. Trips offer parents a broadening experience but are not tied closely to educational goals.
4. There seems to be an unclear parent policy.

V. Presentation of the Data and Results

There were two major objectives evaluated in this program. One concerned specific growth and development achievements of the children in the Summer 1972 Headstart program. The other related to parent participation and attitude. This section shall deal with each separately.

A. Growth and Development

The assessment of growth and development of the children in the program was measured by a checklist containing four special skills areas plus an overall trait rating. The skills areas were divided into specific objectives for development. For example, the Intellectual Development area contained 14 specific objectives:

1. Expresses wish to try new games or routines.
2. Ability to give explanations for his/her behavior.
3. Names instances and forms a conceptual group.
4. Ability to make discriminations of shapes, colors, sizes.
5. Ability to differentiate up from down.
6. Ability to identify several common sounds (cars, buses, etc.).
7. Requests teacher to use particular stories or picture books consistently.
8. Ability to use classroom equipment and materials in intended ways.
9. Ability to build common objects with blocks.
10. Holds book right-side up.
11. Ability to speak in complete sentences.
12. Ability to relate one story in logical sequence.
13. Ability to memorize simple song.
14. Ability to use an adjective.

The Social Development area contained 10.

1. Knows official first and last name.
2. Knows home address.
3. Knows age in years.
4. Can identify self as boy or girl.
5. Obeys requests to sit down.
6. Has confidence sufficient to work on new task.
7. Can use "please" and "thank you".
8. Can understand requests to be quiet.
9. Speaks freely to peers.
10. Speaks freely to adults.

The Physical Development area contained 6:

1. Goes to bathroom on time.
2. Ability to cut with scissors.
3. Can put simple puzzles together.
4. Ability to fasten shoelaces.
5. Ability to feed self.
6. Knows difference between good and poor posture.

and the Health and Safety Habits area contained 7 specific objectives:

1. Ability to recite proper way to cross streets.
2. Ability to say what to do if lost.
3. Ability to recognize policemen and firemen.
4. Washes hands after eating.
5. Washes hands after using toilet.
6. Tastes new foods which are unfamiliar.
7. Eats variety of foods when available.

Overall traits were designated by 7 special skill areas. This latter rating will be dealt with in section A.2.

A.1. The Growth and Development checklist was used to rate each child at the beginning and end of the program. Eight sites returned pre- and post- program tests. The ninth site, P.S. 20, was added to the program after it began and contained only one class. Therefore, it was felt that this omission would not seriously affect the results of the evaluation.

In each special area the skills were measured by checking one of three columns--<u>has acquired</u>, <u>unknown</u>, <u>has not acquired</u>. In turn for each <u>has acquired</u>, the item received 1 point; for <u>unknown</u>, 2 points; for <u>has not acquired</u>, 3 points. Therefore, a total gain in an area was indicated by a <u>lower</u> post-test mean score.

The schools were coded (see Appendix C) and for each school, results in each of the four general skill areas (and for the overall trait rating--see section A.2) were recorded. A t-test was used to determine if differences found were significant: five of the eight schools showed that children had made significant gains in every area of growth and development.

In two schools there was no significant difference in Health and Safety skills. In the eighth school, there was a significant gain only in the area of intellectual development. (See tables 1 through 8.)

Thus, according to our original evaluation design it can be stated that more than 75% of the children in the program made significant gains in Social, Physical and Intellectual Development. Significant gains were reported for only about 65% of the pupils in the area of Health and Safety Habits.

A.2. Overall Trait Rating

This area was divided into seven special skill areas:

1. Self Confidence
2. Curiosity
3. Critical thinking
4. Attitude toward school
5. Self Control
6. Ability to follow routines
7. Motor coordination

The responses were recorded on a continuum from 1 (low) to 7 (high).

The results show that in five schools significant gains in a positive direction were attained. Thus 55% of the children were rated as having made significant growth in the seven areas of overall trait rating.

B. The Parent Questionnaire

A parent questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to check the second evaluation objective-- that 75% of the parents of the children in the Headstart Program will attend at least one school function and that those who attend should have a more positive attitude toward school and home relations.

The questionnaire was sent to the parents of the 560 children in the Headstart Program. One hundred thirty were returned marked address unknown, leaving a total of 430 possible returns. Only 82 parents responded. It had been thought that by timing the arrival of the questionnaire with the last day of the program, the evalutaion would achieve a high percentage of returns. This was not a fact.

Table 1. Growth and Development Checklist: School A

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	55	16.381	4.628
	Post	55	13.272	2.697

t = 5.47
P < 2.62 Significant at the .01 level

Physical Dev.	Pre	54	8.547	1.573
	Post	54	8.018	1.584

t = 2.517 Significant at the .05 level
P < 1.98

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	52	22.884	6.270
	Post	52	17.269	4.130

t = 8.271
P < 2.62 Significant at the .01 level

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	52	12.730	3.349
	Post	52	11.519	4.548

t = 1.897
P > 1.98 at the .05 level. Not significant

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	56	29.625	6.629
	Post	56	30.142	4.933

t = 0.841
P > 1.98 at the .05 level. Not significant

Table 2. Growth and Development Checklist: School B

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	32	15.437	4.771
	Post	32	12.031	2.633

$t = 5.534$
$P < 2.65$ Significant at the .01 level

Physical Dev.	Pre	30	9.733	2.677
	Post	30	7.666	2.425

$t = 4.979$
$P < 2.66$ Significant at the .01 level

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	27	22.629	7.270
	Post	27	18.037	5.847

$t = 3.691$
$P < 2.66$ Significant at the .01 level

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	30	12.433	3.092
	Post	30	8.633	2.760

$t = 5.655$
$P < 2.66$ Significant at the .01 level

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	39	31.871	7.827
	Post	39	33.769	9.308

$t = 2.223$
$P < 1.99$ Significant at the .05 level

Table 3. Growth and Development Checklist: School C

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	43	13.674	4.318
	Post	43	12.627	3.380

t = 1.824
P > 1.99 at the .05 level. Not significant.

Physical Dev.	Pre	43	7.976	2.324
	Post	43	7.558	1.88

t = 0.972
P > 1.99 at the .05 level. Not significant.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	40	22.125	7.703
	Post	40	19.075	7.272

t = 3.135
P < 2.64 Significant at the .01 level.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	43	11.465	10.660
	Post	43	9.534	3.521

t = 1.217
P > 1.99 at the .05 level. Not significant.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	42	30.166	5.843
	Post	42	29.785	4.491

t = 0.524
P > 1.99 at the .05 level. Not significant.

Table 4. Growth and Development Checklist: School D

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	52	17.250	4.685
	Post	52	14.250	2.764

$t = 5.648$
$P < 2.62$ Significant at the .01 level.

Physical Dev.	Pre	54	8.425	1.435
	Post	54	7.666	1.098

$t = 4.489$
$P < 2.62$ Significant at the .01 level.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	53	26.452	6.993
	Post	53	21.905	6.788

$t = 7.978$
$P < 2.62$ Significant at the .01 level.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	54	13.814	4.139
	Post	54	10.925	4.616

$t = 5.182$
$P < 2.62$ Significant at the .01 level.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	53	27.415	6.172
	Post	53	28.075	5.206

$t = 0.949$
$P > 1.98$ at the .05 level. Not significant.

Table 5. Growth and Development Checklist: School E

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	46	20.608	5.462
	Post	46	13.956	4.163

t = 11.501
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Physical Dev.	Pre	45	11.088	2.324
	Post	45	7.977	2.562

t = 9.240
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	41	31.634	6.703
	Post	41	22.609	7.546

t = 9.549
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	45	14.444	3.180
	Post	45	8.911	3.274

t = 9.298
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	45	26.733	9.205
	Post	45	31.311	9.209

t = 4.102
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Table 6. Growth and Development Checklist: School F

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	48	13.104	3.550
	Post	48	10.937	1.743

t = 5.559
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Physical Dev.	Pre	47	8.063	1.308
	Post	47	7.106	1.183

t = 5.043
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	14	18.571	4.987
	Post	14	16.642	3.455

t = 3.046
P < 2.76 Significant at the .01 level.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	46	9.782	2.811
	Post	46	7.891	1.433

t = 5.821
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	45	35.311	6.888
	Post	45	37.022	5.828

t = 2.854
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Table 7. Growth and Development Checklist: School G

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	42	17.928	5.989
	Post	42	11.261	2.274

t = 7.395
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Physical Dev.	Pre	43	9.395	2.977
	Post	43	6.813	0.932

t = 5.962
P < 2.63 Significant at the .01 level.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	20	19.30	4.953
	Post	20	15.70	4.317

t = 3.174
P < 2.71 Significant at the .01 level.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	40	13.275	4.449
	Post	40	8.325	1.525

t = 6.092
P < 2.64 Significant at the .01 level.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	34	26.794	10.834
	Post	34	34.029	7.047

t = 6.404
P < 2.65 Significant at the .01 level

Table 8. Growth and Development Checklist: School H

Test		Number	Mean	S.D.
Social Dev.	Pre	30	16.233	5.110
	Post	30	13.466	3.683

$t = 3.284$
$P < 2.66$ Significant at the .01 level.

Physical Dev.	Pre	32	9.00	1.983
	Post	32	8.062	1.625

$t = 2.897$
$P < 2.65$ Significant at the .01 level.

Intellect. Dev.	Pre	34	24.235	7.560
	Post	34	23.470	6.792

$t = 0.605$
$P > 2.00$ at the .05 level. Not Significant.

Health & Safety Habits	Pre	34	13.294	3.109
	Post	34	11.441	2.945

$t = 2.978$
$P < 2.65$ Significant at the .01 level.

Overall Trait Ratings	Pre	33	28.030	10.156
	Post	33	30.303	8.091

$t = 2.358$
$P < 2.00$ Significant at the .05 level.

An examination of the 82 returns (see Table 9) however, confirms some of the positive and negative observations of the evaluation observer. There was, in most cases, a strong feeling that the program was geared to meet the needs of the children, and the staff was truly concerned with the children's positive growth and development.

There was, however, noted dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of the lunch program, and with the degree of participation in planning activities in the Headstart Program and in the parent program.

Generally speaking, there was an expected favorable reaction on the part of the samll percentage of responses received and analyzed.

Table 9. Parent Questionnaire

	N	YES	%	NO	%
1.	82	56	68.3	26	31.7
2.	79	77	97.5	3	2.5
3.	74	71	96.0	3	4.0
4.	74	a) 12*	20.3	b) 59**	79.7
5.	76	32	42.1	44	57.9
6.	77	65	84.4	12	15.6
7.	76	74	97.3	2	2.7
8.	75	71	94.7	4	5.3
9.	81	Nothing - 3 - 3.6%			
		Many Things - 59 - 72.8%			
		Little - 19 - 23.6%			
10.	80	21	26.2	59	73.8
11.	80	78	97.5	2	2.5
12.	80	42	52.5	38	47.5
13.	60	27	45.0	33	55.0

* a) = few
** b) = fun and useful
No parent checked the negative response--waste of time.

Table 9. (cont'd)

14.	Group Activities	14	17.1%
	Everything	13	15.9
	Trips	43	52.4
	Prepared for Learning	12	14.6
15.	Like Everything	30	36.6%
	Lunch	17	20.8
	Not Enough Activities	11	13.4
	Not Enough Parents on Trips	12	14.6
	No Response	12	14.6
16.	No Response	12	14.7%
	Continue Program	8	9.7
	Parent-Teacher Conferences	18	22.0
	More Trips	10	12.2
	Better Lunches	17	20.7
	Bilingual Teachers	9	11.0
	More Funds	8	9.7
17.	Mothers Programs and Trips	74	90.3%
	None	8	9.7

VI. Recommendations of Project Observer and Evaluator

A. Funding

Funding problems should be settled much before the program begins so that the staff can convene and have time to plan, to recruit children, to purchase materials and to set up classrooms. Late June is too late for adequate preparation.

B. Materials

Continued emphasis on materials which can be manipulated in many ways and which help cognitive development as well as the traditional nursery school approach. Continue to re-collect and save materials.

C. Time Structure

1. An orientation for all staff is necessary each summer. Experienced teachers can perhaps run workshops for new staff.

2. Program should run for at least 6 or 7 weeks in summer.

3. Hours for children should be 9-2. Staff should use the last hour for planning. The Head Teacher should be used as a resource and guidance person.

D. Staff Qualifications

Make clear qualifications desirable in Headstart teachers. Motivation, conscientiousness, and liking kids should have priority. Continue hiring experienced early childhood people.

E. Education Component

Emphasis should be placed on allowing for a period of teacher observation to learn needs of children. This will enable them to set up specific and general goals, think about evaluation and ways to develop cognitive skills.

Good workshop titles might correspond to those suggestions and could be run by people in the system who are already qualified. Familiarize staff with programs in early childhood and research on Headstart.

F. Parent Component

Sharpen goals for parents. Discuss the purpose of their involvement and the relationship of the activities planned to those goals.

G. The program must be deemed successful on the basis of the data examined herein. Certainly, a major recommendation would be to continue the program noting the suggestions made herein. Future evaluation must consider the possibility of tapping parent reaction weekly to insure a larger response than that received. Training for new staff by those who have had experience in Headstart seems a necessity and may well account for the lack of significant results in almost all areas noted for school C.

The participants, staff, and community groups involved all contributed a great deal to the program despite some serious frustration at the onset of the program.

Project Staff

Senior Researchers:

Dr. Julian Roberts, chairman of the Curriculum and Instruction Department at Ferkauf Graduate School

Dr. Lee Joiner, Teaching and Learning Research Corporation staff

Dr. Louis Hofmann, Teaching and Learning Research Corporation staff

Program Observer:

Lorna Edmundson, Teaching and Learning Research Corporation staff

TEACHING & LEARNING

APPENDIX A

Growth and Development Checklist

Pre-School Child Development Program

I INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT	Child Has Acquired	Unknown	Has Not Acquired
1. Expresses wish to try new games or routines	_____	_____	_____
2. Ability to give explanations for his/her behavior	_____	_____	_____
3. Names instances and forms a conceptual group	_____	_____	_____
4. Ability to make discriminations of shapes, colors, sizes	_____	_____	_____
5. Ability to differentiate up from down.	_____	_____	_____
6. Ability to identify several common sounds (cars, buses, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
7. Requests teacher to use particular stories or picture books consistently	_____	_____	_____
8. Ability to use classroom equipment and materials in intended ways	_____	_____	_____
9. Ability to build common objects with blocks	_____	_____	_____
10. Holds book right-side up	_____	_____	_____
11. Ability to speak in complete sentences	_____	_____	_____
12. Ability to relate one story in logical sequence	_____	_____	_____
13. Ability to memorize simple song	_____	_____	_____
14. Ability to use an adjective	_____	_____	_____

TEACHING & LEARNING

Name _____

Teacher _____

Growth and Development Checklist
Pre-school Child Development Program

II SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	Child Has Acquired	Unknown	Has Not Acquired
1. Knows official first and last name	_____	_____	_____
2. Knows home address	_____	_____	_____
3. Knows age in years	_____	_____	_____
4. Can identify self as boy or girl	_____	_____	_____
5. Obeys requests to sit down	_____	_____	_____
6. Has confidence sufficient to work on new task	_____	_____	_____
7. Can use "please" and "thank you"	_____	_____	_____
8. Can understand requests to be quiet	_____	_____	_____
9. Speaks freely to peers	_____	_____	_____
10. Speaks freely to adults	_____	_____	_____
III PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT			
1. Goes to bathroom on time	_____	_____	_____
2. Ability to cut with scissors	_____	_____	_____
3. Can put simple puzzles together	_____	_____	_____
4. Ability to fasten shoelaces	_____	_____	_____
5. Ability to feed self	_____	_____	_____
6. Knows difference between good and poor posture	_____	_____	_____

IV HEALTH AND SAFETY HABITS	Child Has Acquired	Unknown	Has Not Acquired
1. Ability to recite proper way to cross streets	_____	_____	_____
2. Ability to say what to do if lost	_____	_____	_____
3. Ability to recognize policemen and firemen	_____	_____	_____
4. Washes hands after eating	_____	_____	_____
5. Washes hands after using toilet	_____	_____	_____
6. Tastes new foods which are unfamiliar	_____	_____	_____
7. Eats variety of foods available	_____	_____	_____

V OVERALL TRAIT RATING	LO 1	2	3	4	5	6	HIGH 7
1. Self-confidence	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. Curiosity	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. Critical thinking	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. Attitude toward school	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. Self-control	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. Ability to follow routines	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
7. Motor coordination	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

QUESTIONARIO
DE LOS PADRES DE LA FAMILIA
HEADSTART - VERANO
1972

INDICA, MARCA O EXCREVA la respuesta que representa mejor su opinion

PREGUNTAS	RESPUESTAS
1) ¿Assistio usted (Vd.) a mas de una actividad de los padres de familia?	Si No
2) ¿Basado en su experiencia de programa, cree Vd. que la escuela esta realmente interesada en los padres de familia de la comunidad?	Si No
3) ¿Despues de assistar a las actividades de los padres de familia, comprende Vd. mejor como la escuela puede ayudar a su hijo(a)?	Si No
4) ¿Que piensa Vd. de las actividades do los padres de familia? a/ DIVERTIDA_____ b/DIVERTIDA Y UTIL_____ c/ PERDIDA DE TIEMPO_____	
5) ¿Ha ayudado Vd. a los planes de excursiones de "adres y hijos"?	Si No
6) ¿Durante el programa de verano, le fue posible preguntar y recebir respuestas utiles del personal docente (del personal del programa)?	Si No
7) ¿Cree Vd. que su hijo(a) recibo el eipo de ayuda que merece y necesita?	Si No
8) ¿Despues de ver y assistir al programa de verano, Vd. cree que su hijo(a) va la aprovechar mejor la escuela?	Si No
9) ¿Que aprendio su hijo(a) durante el verano? MUCHO___ POCO___ NADA___	
10) ¿En su opinion, que fue lo major del programa? a/ Mantuvo a mi hijo(a) ocupado _____ b/ Mi hijo aprendio algo util en la escuela _____	
11) ¿Cree Vd. que el maestro quise (queria) ayudar a su hijo(a)?	Si No
12) ¿Estuvo du hijo(a) ausente una vez?	Si No
13) ¿Due fue lo mejor del programa? _____ _____	

14) ¿Si su hijo(a) estuvo ausente por 2 o mas dias el auxiliar familia le llamo o lo visito a Vd.? Si No

15) ¿Que fue lo prior del programa? _____

_____

16) ¿En que forma se poderia mejorar el programa? _____

_____

17) ¿A que actividades asistio Vd.?

APPENDIX C PARENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

CIRCLE the answer that best fits your opinion about the program: YES NO

OR - FILL IN a short answer when your personal opinion is asked for.

QUESTIONS

	ANSWERS
1) Did you attend more than one parent activity this summer?	Yes No
2) From what you saw of the Summer Program, do you think the school is really interested in the community parents?	Yes No
3) After attending parent activities, do you understand better how the school can help your child?	Yes No
4) What do you think of the parent activities? FUN___ FUN & USEFUL___ WASTE OF TIME_____	
5) Did you help plan trips for parents and children?	Yes No
6) During the Summer Program were you able to ask questions and get useful answers from the school staff?	Yes No
7) Do you think your child gets the kind of help that he or she needs?	Yes No
8) After attending the Summer Program do you think your child will do better in school during the next school year?	Yes No
9) What did your child learn this summer? NOTHING___MANY THINGS___LITTLE___	
10) In your opinion, what was the best part of the program: a. It kept my child busy._____ b. My child learned something which will help him in school._____	
11) Do you feel the teacher wanted to help your child?	Yes No
12) Was your child ever absent this summer?	Yes No
13) If your child was absent for two days or more, did the Family Worker call you or visit you?	Yes No

14) What was the best thing about the program?_____

_____

15) What was the worst thing about the program? _____

_____

16) What one thing would help improve the program? _____

_____

17) What activities did you attend? _____

_____

APPENDIX D

School Codes

School	Code
P.S. 15	A
P.S. 19	B
P.S. 61	C
P.S. 63	D
P.S. 64	E
P.S. 134	F
P.S. 140	G
P.S. 188	H

Function No. 33-3-1605

IDENTIFICATION AND TREATMENT OF PERCEPTUAL DIFFICULTIES

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR: LOUIS J. HOFMANN, PH.D.

I. Program Description

The program was designed to serve thirty kindergarten children identified as high "risks" from P.S. 61 and to offer diagnostic service to 50 other children from other elementary schools in the district.

The project ran from July 5 to August 8 with twenty-five sessions being devoted to the application of the perceptual remediation techniques which have been developed at the Learning Disorders Unit of the New York University Medical Center. The remediation aspect of the program was conducted from 9:00 A.M. - 12:00 P.M. at P.S. 61, while the diagnostic services were performed at New York University and at other schools in the district, the major personnel funded under the Title I Umbrella Proposal were a school psychologist and two supervising teachers.

II. Teaching and Diagnostic Technique

The teaching or perceptual stimulation techniques were directly from conceptions about the nature of reading disability. The New York University team believe that if a child is handicapped by low visual auditory, tackle etc. perceptual acuity, he will experience great difficulty in learning how to read and perform academically. Thus, their approach focuses on locating students who have a high probability of future reading difficulties and retraining their perceptual modalities to eliminate the perceptual deficits. The Search Battery, a collection of diagnostic techniques which has been extensively studied, is used to locate these "high risk" students.

The teaching strategies are attempts to provide extensive experience and the perceptual modality is the least developed. The student is usually taught in a one-to-one situation. However, groups of five to ten were formed during the summer porgram.

III. Evaluation Design

The evaluation activities were attempts to assess whether the services outlined in the program proposal were provided, and whether the students served in the program significantly improved in their "Search Battery" scores.

IV. Findings

There were twenty-three students who enrolled in the program at P.S. 61, and were administered the Search Battery at the beginning of the summer. Fourteen of these students attended at least ten sessions and thirteen were tested at both the beginning and end of the program.

Table I contains the statistical analysis of pretest and post-test scores of the thirteen students who were tested.

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STATISTICAL TESTS OF SCORES ON THE SEARCH BATTERY

Test	Pretest mean	Post-test mean	Total ratio
Bender (Koppitz)	16.2	20.3	4.74
WRAT (oral reasoning)	.6	1.02	6.04
Lamb Chops Matching	4.30	7.53	5.37
Lamb Chops Recall	2.61	4.15	1.96
Rote Sequencing	.15	1.53	4.18
Articulation	24.0	26.3	2.73
Intermodal Dictation	.15	3.76	3.58
Monroe Auditory Discrimination	14.53	17.84	6.17
Goodenough Draw A Person	5.28	6.46	3.92

The full year evaluation report for the school year 1971-1972 also contained information on changes on these Search Battery scores. These were gathered however for the full school year. Table II presents a comparison of mean score changes for the summer and full year programs.

TABLE 2

MEAN SEARCH BATTERY SCORE CHANGES DURING THE SUMMER 1972 and 1971-1972 SCHOOL YEAR

Test	Full Year Mean Change*	Summer Change
Bender (Koppitz)	4.32	4.1
WRAT (Oral Reasoning)	1.39	.41
Lamb Chops Matching	2.86	3.23

Test	Full Year Mean Change*	Summer Change
Lamb Chops Recall	2.47	1.54
Rote Sequencing	4.81	2.3
Articulation	11.00	3.61
Intermodal Dictation	5.67	3.31
Monroe Auditory Discrimination	4.48*	1.18

* From data presented in Full Year evaluation report.

There are two tests in the Battery in which the change over the full school year is similar in magnitude to the change during the Summer Session. There is one test in which the change is greater in the shorter session than in the longer session. This would seem to indicate that increase in scores are potentially due to a strong testing effect, or that increments in scores are possible with very short intervention periods. In all but three of the tests, the gain in score during the short Summer Session is more than 50% as large as the gain attained during the 1971-1972 testing period. (about 8 months). This issue deserves further study by the Learning Disorders Unit.

V. Discussion

Last Summer's evaluation report on this recycled program raised the question of whether there was sufficient interest or understanding of the program on the part of parents of eligible children. This question arose because of the low attendance last year. Although attendance improved somewhat this year, this still appears to be a problem. The staff of the Learning Disorders Unit reported that commitments were received from thirty two parents. Extensive following activity yielded attendance by twenty three, but two of these attended only one session.

The diagnostic activity which is important for the recycled full year program was much more extensive this year than last. The proposal stated that diagnostic services by physicians, psychologists, teachers and social workers would be offered to fifty students. The records kept by the Learning Disorders Unit indicate that forty-one students were examined during the Summer (in addition to the twenty three who were examined and scheduled for classes.) This came close to their goal of fifty.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

The program was successful in producing changes in the variables which are the focus of the perceptual stimulation teaching activities. The program did not quite attain its stated goals of training thirty P.S. 61 kindergarten students and diagnosing fifty others in other District I schools.

It is recommended that if the program is recycled in following Summers that commitments are gathered from a larger sample of parents than the proposed sample because of the attrition prior to and during the program.

It is also recommended that the Learning Disorders Unit investigate more fully whether the increase in perceptual scores is due mainly to increased test sophistication on the part of the students or whether it is due to the perceptual stimulation program. This program relies substantially on the validity of the Search Battery in the selection of students to receive treatment, and in the measurement of whether the program is having its predicted effect. It would seem-therefore very desirable to continue in the assessment of the reality and stability of these testing procedures.

Function No. 33-3-1606

CONTINUAL DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN OF RETARDED MENTAL DEVELOPMENT

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR: LEE M. JOINER, PH.D.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: NATHAN STILLMAN, PH.D.

I. Program Description

The 1972 Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development in District I, Manhattan was a continued summer program for seventy retarded children designated as either trainable or educable. The educable group consisted of children with individual intelligence quotients ranging between fifty and seventy-five and the trainable group was made up of children with scores below fifty. Included among the children were perceptually handicapped, neurologically impaired and socially and emotionally immature. Five classes were conducted at P.S. 19 and one class for multiple handicapped children was held at P.S. 137.

The staff consisted of a program trainer, a coordinator, six classroom teachers, a health and physical education teacher, six educational assistants, a part-time school psychologist, a part-time social worker and a secretary. In addition, four student teachers from New York University were assigned to the program for the final two weeks.

The program began on July 5, 1972 and terminated on August 8, 1972 with classes held on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. except on Tuesday when the school day was extended to 2:30 P.M. Because of a reduction in funds, the 1972 program was shortened by one week and daily class time reduced by an average of one hour from the 1971 schedule.

At P.S. 19, seventy-four children were pre-registered in the program and sixty actually enrolled which is the number funded. Several children had gone to camp, a few were visiting Puerto Rico and one child had moved away from the area. The one class of multiple handicapped children conducted at P.S. 137 had ten children pre-registered with nine in actual attendance, one less than the number funded.

Prior to the beginning of the program, the program trainer and program coordinator met with the teachers and educational assistants to develop the summer curriculum. These meetings were held on the participants own time. The teachers were familiar with most of the children enrolled in the program either having had them in their regular classes during the school year or knowing them from the previous summer. All of the teachers were licensed CRMD teachers and had been staff members in the summer program of 1971. Four of the seven educational assistants had also participated in the program the previous summer.

Background material and class records of each child were reviewed and the strengths and weaknesses of each youngster were analyzed. On the basis of this knowledge, a general plan for the entire program was developed relating to the organization of classes and the specific curriculum for each group. In many cases, specific plans were formulated for children who had special problems in

perceptual-motor areas. It is important to point out that the teacher assigned to the multiple handicapped class at P.S. 137 was not involved in these planning sessions because it was assumed that he would continue with the same program that he conducted for multiple handicapped children during the regular school year. In addition, there was some uncertainty as to whether his class would come under the supervision of the building principal at P.S. 137 or be supervised by the program coordinator.

In addition to the problem of mental retardation, the children participating in the program came from disadvantaged areas of the district and had an extremely limited experiential background. In most cases, their activities centered around the home or the immediate neighborhood and very few have had the opportunity of visiting places of interest. In view of this situation, eight field trips were planned that would not only be enjoyable but would contribute in a meaningful way to the children's limited experiences. Half of the trips were scheduled within the local area and the other half to places outside of the city. The nine children enrolled in the program at P.S. 137 did not participate in these field trips.

Five classes were organized at P.S. 19 and one class at P.S. 137. Assignments at P.S. 19 were made on the basis of chronological age, mental age, academic achievement and special needs. Table I presents the distribution of children in the various classes.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN ACCORDING TO CLASS AND SCHOOL

Class	Number	School
Primary I (young educable retarded)	12	P.S. 19
Primary II (young educable retarded)	12	P.S. 19
Intermediate (older educable retarded)	12	P.S. 19
T M R - young (young trainable)	12	P.S. 19
T M R - older (older trainable)	12	P S. 19
Multiple Handicapped (educable retarded)	9	P.S. 137
Total	69	

Table II presents the distribution of specific physical handicaps for the retarded children at P.S. 137.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICAL HANDICAPS

FOR CLASS AT P.S. 137

Physical Handicap	Number	Retardation
Asthma	5	Educable
Deafness	1	Educable
Visual Deficiency	1	Educable
Hydrocephalic	1	Educable
Polio	1	Educable

The program developed at P.S. 19 was completely departmentalized with the children going to a different teacher each period. The teachers, in addition to being educated and experienced in working with retarded children, had specific areas of specialization. The program was built upon these specialized areas and included arts and crafts, home-making, language arts, group guidance, music, photography, industrial arts, and physical education. The field trip experiences were also integrated with the regular classroom activities and certain specific projects and exhibits resulted from these learnings.

Table III presents the schedule of a typical day at P.S. 19.

TABLE 3

CLASS SCHEDULE FOR ALL GROUPS

AT P.S. 19

Class	9:00 9:40	9:45 10:20	10:25 11:00	11:00 11:40	11:45 12:20	12:20 1:00
TMR I	Home-making	Lang. Arts	Ind. Arts	Lunch	Arts & Crafts	Music
TMR II	Lang. Arts	Ind. Arts	Arts & Crafts	Lunch	Music	Home-making
Int.	Ind. Arts	Music	Lang. Arts	Lunch	Home-making	Arts & Crafts
Prim. I	Music	Arts & Crafts	Home-making	Lunch	Lang. Arts	Ind. Arts
Prim. II	Arts & Crafts	Home-making	Music	Lunch	Ind. Arts	Lang. Arts

The physical education instructor worked with small groups of three or four children for thirty minute periods throughout the day. The language arts teacher included experiences in group relationships and personal-social behavior as part of her program. The industrial arts teacher focused on prevocational training with the older children.

Table IV lists the field trips for the children at P.S. 19.

TABLE 4

FIELD TRIPS FOR THE CHILDREN

AT P.S. 19

Date	Place
July 11	Adventurer's Inn
July 13	Animal Nursery
July 18	Staten Island Zoo
July 20	Fireman's Taining School
July 25	Turtle Back Zoo
July 27	Brooklyn Botanical Gardens
August 1	Jungle Habitat
August 3	New York Aquarium

On Monday, Wednesday and Friday of each week, the program had the services of a school psychologist and a social worker. Most of the time alloted to the psychologist was spent in retesting and evaluating children in the program to determine whether changes should be made in their placement. Although CRMD children are supposed to be scheduled for re-evaluation every two years, a number of the children had not been retested for up to six years. The psychologist also held a number of conferences with teachers regarding individual children and attempted to develop a group therapy program for treating children with more serious behavioral problems. Whenever any recommendation for a change in class placement was contemplated, the psychologist would discuss this with the parents to help them understand the meaning of the proposed change. There was no time allotted for working with the multiple handicapped group at P.S. 137.

The school social worker worked in conjunction with the school psychologist. He participated in case conferences,

visited homes, interviewed parents at school, and made many referrals to appropriate outside agencies for medical or social service problems. Because of time limitations, no social work service was allocated to the program at P.S. 137.

Children at P.S. 19 were transported between home and school by bus. When children arrived at school, they were met by their official class teachers and educational assistants and taken to their rooms. The first period of the program was designed so that the children remained with their respective home-room teachers. At each subsequent period, the groups moved to other classrooms according to the schedule. Just before 1 P.M., the groups reconvened in their official home-rooms where the teachers prepared them for dismissal and then escorted them to the buses.

The program at P.S. 137 differed markedly from the program at P.S. 19 The teacher at P.S. 137 picked up the children in his own car and arrived at school between 7:50 A.M. and 8 A.M. The first twenty minutes were spent either in quiet games, group discussions or in completing any unfinished projects from the previous day. Since there were only nine children in the class, the schedule was very flexible and in general did not have any rigidly set periods.

Table V presents the typical daily schedule at P.S. 137.

TABLE 5

CLASS SCHEDULE AT P.S. 137

Activity	Time
Informal opening period	15-20 min.
Reading, spelling, writing	45 min.
Recreation	20 min.
Math, social studies	45 min.
Arts and crafts	45 min.
Music	20 min.
Lunch	30 min.
Transportation home	20 min.

On Mondays, the children had a library period where the librarian read stories to them and where they were encouraged to select books for reading in class or at home. On Wednesday, they joined all of the summer classes at P.S. 137 in a school assembly program.

II. Program Objectives

As stated in the original proposal, the Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development in District I, Manhattan had the following major objectives.

1. To maintain, reinforce and increase children's learnings.

2. To improve personal and social skills.

3. To introduce new methods and materials into programs for retarded children.

III. Evaluation Procedures

The program was evaluated by observing classes, interviewing staff and children and by having teachers complete a schedule of behavioral objectives for each child in the program on a pre-post basis. Six visits were made to the program at P.S. 19 and three visits to the program at P.S. 137.

The schedule used to assess the extent to which children improved during the course of the program in self-helpskills, language, social skills and knowledge is as follows:

A. Self-help Skills

1. To be able to remove or put on an article of clothing
2. To use handkerchief or facial tissue
3. To eat without supervision
4. To wash face and hands
5. To take care of personal belongings
6. To know home address and phone number

B. Language

1. To write own name clearly
2. To know the names of other children
3. To use the names of teachers
4. To not interrupt others who are speaking
5. To pronounce words clearly
6. To respond to questions in phrases or sentences

C. Social Skills

1. To resolve conflicts with other students
2. To control temper
3. To work with another student on a project
4. To refrain from teasing or "baiting" other students
5. To initiate social interactions with peers
6. To use courteous expressions such as "please," "thanks"

D. Knowledge

1. To recognize common signs such as "stop"
2. To be able to go to and from school without getting detained or lost
3. To be able to identify something that was reported in the news yesterday
4. To be able to count money
5. To find an item and price in a catalogue
6. To make change up to $1.00

IV. Findings

Staff

The staff assigned to this program were all experienced CRMD teachers who were familiar with most of the children either from the previous summer program or from having had many of the children in their regular classes during the school year. Because of this, the program opened without the usual delays and difficulties and a high degree of stability was present from the beginning.

The evaluator was not only welcomed into each class but was actually urged by each teacher to visit the program as often as possible. As a group, they related well to each other and cooperated fully in developing a very effective total program. This judgment is based on the fact that during the course of the five weeks, each teacher made a point of emphasizing to the evaluator the contributions of other teachers as well as educational assistants to the academic and personal-social growth of the children. The teachers were warm, patient, sensitive and displayed a high degree of empathy for the children. The classroom climate was relaxed, free from tension and one that was conducive to learning. The teachers' roles seemed to be one of guiding children rather than dominating them. As a result, the children seemed free and relaxed and at no time did the evaluator notice any youngster who was not involved in some constructive learning experience. In fact, many of the children invited their intellectually normal brothers and sisters to visit the program because they felt it was such a pleasurable experience. Although this was not encouraged, whenever a guest arrived, he was permitted to participate in the program for that day. In the opinion of this evaluator, this action made a significant contribution to the self-concept of many retarded children since they were able to interact with normal children as well as to participate with them in certain activities.

The program also benefited from an extremely capable and experienced group of educational assistants. They were utilized in numerous ways and made a significant contribution to the program. They were generally perceived as regular teachers by the children and in at least three instances, the evaluator was unable to differentiate between teacher and educational assistant when initial classroom observations were made. In addition to their classroom responsibilities, the educational assistants visited the homes, brought children to school when for one reason or another, the bus missed a "pick-up," and purchased necessary supplies for the program.

The program trainer helped organize the program, made budgetary requests, ordered materials and acted as an advisor. She was available only for the first week and a half of the summer session but continued her contact with the program co-ordinator regarding the progress of the program. The evaluator had one meeting with the program trainer and as a result of this conference, the general impression was favorable. She seemed to have a high degree of personal interest in the area of mental retardation and saw the need for developing more refined techniques for educating retarded children.

The program coordinator was the person responsible for every phase of the daily program. He was the most active and involved administrator that this evaluator has ever known. At no time did the evaluator ever find the program coordinator just sitting at his desk. He was constantly involved in such varied activities as handling a particular problem, visiting a classroom, taking a child to the bathroom, showing a movie or meeting with individual staff members. He arrived at school early in order to handle any of the paper work and remained at school at the end of the day to complete any necessary details. His presence and support contributed immeasuribly to the success of the program.

Physical Facilities

The facilities at both schools were in good repair, clean, light and adequately furnished for the requirements of the program. The room used for the multiple handicapped at P.S. 137 was their regular classroom with its own toilet facilities including a walking ramp, handrails close to the blackboard, and work benches. The gymnasium was made available at both schools on a regularly scheduled basis.

Lunches were prepared and served in the cafeterias of each school. The staff at P.S. 19 considered some of the meals rather meager and inadequate for the children. They felt that there had been some improvement over the previous summer but that there was still a need for more substantial and better balanced meals. The progaam coordinator pointed out that many of the children come from poverty level homes and look forward to the lunch at school. On the other hand, the teacher at P.S. 137 only had praise for the lunches at his school. He felt that the handicapped children evoked a sympathetic response from the cook and as a result, she gave them large portions and extra desserts.

Transportation was probably the major porblem in the program. For the first three days, there was no bus service available and the staff members went out to the homes and brought children to school. When the bus schedule was finally worked out the routes organized, one bus driver went on vacation for a week. As a result the substitute driver who was not familiar with the children or the area failed to meet a number of the children and the attendance in the program was reduced for several days.

Program

Since the program at P.S. 19 was departmentalized, each area will be discussed separately.

The class in language arts, social skills and guidance focused for the most part on developing appropriate behavior patterns which would enable retarded children to interact more effectively with the total environment. By the use of Eye Gate Series of cassette tapes and film strips, guided discussions and role playing, the children were involved in seeking solutions to a variety of everyday experiences. Some of the value areas that were considered included responsibility, telling the truth, stealing and kindness. In addition, certain affective areas were also discussed such as, "Who am I?," "Why do my feelings change?," and "What can I do about it?" For the older children such topics as job interviews and occupations were explored. The teacher attempted to stimulate discussion by posing a series of open-ended questions and permitting children to express their views. At times, she would try to have the group arrive at some consensus but at no time did she present the response that she felt was correct. This approach encouraged some youngsters to verbalize feelings and thoughts and contributed greatly to improved self-confidence. During some observations, a few of the children did not participate verbally but the evaluator's impression was that they were certainly following the discussion. This approach has tremendous possibilities for retarded children as well as all classes.

The industrial arts program had as its major goals the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes about occupations and the world of work. They were given the opportunity of using a variety of tools and of completing a number of projects. The instructor encouraged the children to apply their knowledge to the tasks that they had undertaken and rather than just giving information, he attempted by "Socratic" methods to have them provide the appropriate answers. This took much patience but as a result, the students' sense of self-worth was significantly enhanced. Several situations were arranged where children had to work cooperatively in order to complete the project successfully.

The class in homemaking created the kind of learning experiences that helped children develop some of the necessary skills that would enable them to function as contributing members of the family. They selected the correct number of dishes to serve the class. They learned the proper use of silverware. They improved their motor coordination by pouring, stirring, beating and washing. It was interesting to observe the changes that occurred in the children during the five week period. Initially, many of the children were reluctant even to try to measure, pour or stir but toward the end of the program most of them were completely involved. Here again, the teacher made every effort to have the children apply their knowledge of arithmetic and reading to specific homemaking tasks.

The arts and crafts program provided the children with many opportunities for experiencing success and satisfaction. The teacher encouraged a degree of creativity by encouraging individual choice of mateirals rather than having all copying something in the exact same way. She had a variety of materials available in the class and the children were encouraged to explore whatever appealed to them. As a result, more youngsters had an opportunity to work with new and different materials which should contribute to their general feelings of self confidence. The use of puppetry and mask making impressed the evaluator as a particularly innovative approach for retarded children. Dramatizing certain situations while concealed from the audience permitted some of the more quiet, fearful and anxious children to come alive and participate actively.

The music program was conducted by the music supervisor of the district and focused on the three areas of singing, playing and listening. The children joined in the singing with real enthusiasm and developed a repertoire of a number of old as well as new songs. They learned to use rhythm instruments and accompanied the instructor while she played the piano. Again, the progress of the children during the five weeks was quite dramatic. At first, most of them had no sense of rhythm and seemed completely at a loss in this activity. However by the end of the program, the evaluator was able to observe groups of children using rhythm instruments to accompany the pianist in at least three different songs. In addition, they were able to read and follow simple rhythm symbols. Tapes were used by the instructor to demonstrate examples of different kinds of music and the children learned to differentiate among African, Spanish, popular, electronic and classical music.

The work in perceptual-motor skills was done primarily with the trainable classes and to a lesser degree with the younger educable retarded. The program followed the approach developed by Sheila Benyon and emphasized the areas of body image, position in space, from consistency and sensory integration. The instructor worked for about fifteen minutes in developing specific skills and would spend about another fifteen minutes in integrating these skills into some activity such as a game. Very definite progress was observed during the course of the summer program.

In discussions with the staff as well as with some of the children, the field trips were considered a very successful part of the program. For children with such limited experiential backgrounds, the trips broadened their horizons and provided them with opportunities to move out into the larger world. On one occasion when the bus broke down on the return trip and was delayed about six hours, the staff reported that the children handled the situation in a mature way without becoming upset or anxious. When the evaluator visited the program the next day, the children were able to discuss the experience as if it were merely part of the general routine. This seemed to support the impressions of the staff.

The program for the multiple handicapped at P.S. 137 seemed, in general, to be a continuation of the regualr school program. The atmosphere in the class was relaxed and the children responded warmly to the teacher. There was a good deal of work in reading and arithmetic with individual children and it was the evaluator's impression that at least two or three of the children were more competent than a great many normal children. Since this class did not have the services of a psychologist and many had not been retested, it is conceivable that their original I. Q. score was influenced more by their physical handicap than by mental limitations. This was discussed with the instructor who agreed that retesting was definitely in order for some children in his group.

Although the part-time services of a psychologist and social worker were extremely helpful to the program, these services were still inadequate for the needs of the children. It is the evaluator's understanding that retarded children are supposed to be retested every two years; yet, there were children in the program who had not been retested for as long as six years. The summer program, therefore, offers an excellent opportunity for re-evaluating a large number of children. As a result of this summer's work by the psychologist, several children were changed from trainable to educable classes and some were moved from educable to trainable classes. Even more important, some were returned to regular classes.

One of the major objectives of the program was to determine the extent to which children would attain certain behavioral objectives in the areas of self-help skills, language, social skills and knowledge. The objectives checked by a teacher represented specific skills or knowledge that a child needed to learn to function more adequately given his age and level of mental development. This list was completed by the teacher for each child during the first week of the program and again during the last week of the program. Since they checked only those objectives that had not been attained, the lower the score the higher the achievement. Table VI presents an analysis of the findings.

TABLE 6

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES ON PRE AND POST TESTS

	M	S.D.	+
Pre	2.496	1.952	17.770*
Post	0.914	1.426	17.770*

* A "+" of this magnitude is significant at the .001 level.

V. Summary and Recommendations

The 1972 Continual Developmental Program for Children of Retarded Mental Development in District 1, Manhattan was a continued summer program for seventy retarded children designated as either trainable or educable. Five classes were conducted at P.S. 19 and one class for multiple handicapped children was held at P.S. 137.

The entire staff of teachers, educational assistants, specialists and administrators showed a high degree of professional competency in planning, organizing and implementing an effective program for mentally retarded children. The staff members were warm, friendly and sensitive to the needs of the students and as a result a learning climate was created that was conducive to personal, social and cognitive growth. The departmentalized program at P.S. 19 gave the children an opportunity to relate to more people and also enabled the teachers to maximize their contributions to the total program based on their individual areas of specialization.

The following recommendations are made for future programs:

1. This program should definitely be continued and the period extended to six weeks with the daily schedule expanded by one hour. This would bring the summer program back to the level at which it operated in 1971. Since retarded children from poverty areas are extremely limited in the kinds of activities in which they can engage, the continuation of this program becomes imperative.

2. The services of the psychologist and social worker should become full time so that they can provide more effectively for the needs of the children at P.S. 19 and also be serving the program at P.S. 137.

3. There is a need for a greater coordination between the program at P.S. 19 and the one at P.S. 137. Although the two schools are widely separated, it should be possible to have the instructor at P.S. 137 attend meetings with the staff at P.S. 19 and to have his group join in at least some of the field trips.

Function No. 33-3-1607

SUMMER DAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROGRAM

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR: ALAN J. SIMON

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: WALTER PEDERSEN

I. Program Description

A. Background

The 1972 Summer Day Elementary School Program (SDES) was designed to provide remedial instruction for the Elementary School Children of District I. Located in two centers, PS 20 and PS 137, the program was designed to serve approximately 480 children, including a small number of non-public school students. Classes met a total of 25 three-hour sessions (9:00 A.M. until 12:00 noon) from July 5 to August 8. Snacks and lunches were provided each day.

B. Selection of Students

Near the end of the 1971-72 academic year, letters were sent out to the public and non-public elementary schools in District I. The letter described the program and asked the schools to urge students who could possibly benefit from this sort of remedial program to attend.

Unlike other years, there were no registration days allocated for the 1972 SDES program. Students arrived at their respective schools in the morning of the first day of the program, were registered, assigned a grade and placed in a class. Since over 600 students registered for the program at both schools, the office staff had some difficulty carrying out registration procedures in the time allotted. Teachers were almost universal in their concern for the disruption, this sort of procedure caused in the first days' learning process. Strong consideration should therefore, be given in reestablishing at least one registration day prior to the beginning of the program.

Neither school placed any limitations on registrants, according to the principals. All students, regardless of home school or where they lived in the District, were accepted into the program.

Registration figures show 27 schools represented among the feeder schools, plus some parochial schools. Of these six may be considered major feeder schools sending twenty or more students. Those were P.S. 20, 164, 137, 188, 134, and 4. Approximately 105 parochial school students were reported enrolled in the program, most of them at PS 20.

The registration figures were much higher at PS 20 than at 137. PS 137 is located at the southern part of the district and is close to the East River. It can only draw from its immediate area and from the north. PS 20 is more centrally located and can draw from all directions.

In Tables 1 and 2 relative frequencies are provided which represent the number of enrollees in each of the two Summer Day Elementary Schools arranged according to home school. These data cannot be considered entirely representative of the student population at the end of the program. Some of the originally enrolled students did not return to the program, while other children were dismissed because they did not maintain acceptable attendance. Nonetheless, these data are useful for determining the extent to which the program's availability was disseminated.

Table 1: Relative Frequencies According to Home Schools of Students in SDES Program - - - - P.S. 137

Home School	f	N = 172
P.S. 4	1	
P.S. 110	9	
P.S. 134	25	
P.S. 137	116	
J.H.S. 56	11	
Parochial	10	

Table 2: Relative Frequencies According to Home Schools of Students in SDES Program - - - - P.S. 20

Home School	f	N = 474
P.S. 4	27	
15	1	
20	135	
61	2	
63	13	
64	7	
97	2	
122	5	
137	1	
140	17	
160	124	
188	36	
J.H.S. 22	6	
71	3	
Parochial	95	

C. Ethnic Composition of Student Body

The program's population was also considered in terms of its ethnic composition relative to the ethnicity of the total district during the regular school year. The schools were asked to submit a classroom census which was compared to a similar census which was taken by the District in January 1972.

The following is a table comparing the ethnic composition of each SDES school with the District.

Table 3: Ethnic Distribution in District 1 as Compared to Ethnic Distributions in Two SDES Schools

SCHOOL	PUERTO RICAN AND SPANISH	BLACK	ORIENTAL AND OTHER	TOTAL
DIST 1, M	71.5%	13.9%	14.6%	100%
PS 20	72.3%	8.0%	19.7%	100%
PS 137	68.2%	13.4%	18.4%	100%
TOTAL SDES PROGRAM	71.2%	9.8%	19.0%	100%

In general, SDES and District wide ethnic comparisons are compatible. As in past years, Black students were a bit under represented (13.9% vs. 9.8% SDES), while Oriental and other students were slightly over represented (19.0% SDES v. 14.6%).

II. Program Objectives

The major program objectives were:

A. To bring about improvement in reading and mathematics skills.

B. To maintain high attendance.

III. Evaluation Objectives

The original evaluation proposal called for an analysis of attendance and reading achievement data to meet the following evaluation objectives:

A. To determine whether or not 80% of the students improved their reading skills by .2 grade equivalent units.

B. To determine whether or not 80% of the students in the program attended 60% or more of the class sessions.

In addition to these objectives, the program was also evaluated in terms of mathematics improvement at the .2 grade equivalent level. Other data concerning the overall functioning of the program was gained from a survey of teacher attitudes, student demographic data and weekly visits to each school.

IV. Methods and Procedures

A. Reading Achievement Objective

Two types of reading assessments were used by the schools. At PS 137 initial reading levels were determined from the Sullivan Programmed Reading Placement Tests.* Final measures were computed by converting the last book that the student completed into grade equivalent units (e.g. Book 9 equaled 3.7 G.E.). PS 20 employed an informal reading test technique. In most cases, initial placement was determined by how well a student was able to read passages from different level readers. In other cases more formal techniques such as the Botel Word Opposites tests were used. Final reading levels were determined by repeating the process for each student.

Pre and post program data was acquired on 493 subjects or approximately 80% of the total students reported in attendance.

B. Attendance Objective

Classroom records were used to determine attendance figures. Attendance data was available for 25 out of the 26 classes in the program. Data was reported on a total of 591 students or almost all the students enrolled in the program.

C. Mathematics Achievement Objective

Pre and post mathematics achievement data was obtained in much the same manner as reading achievement data. At. PS 137 levels were determined from the results of the Sullivan Programmed Mathematics Placement tests while at PS 20 more informal estimates were used. These included teacher made diagnostic tests relating to certain mathematical skills or in some cases teacher judgement based on student classroom performance.

D. Student Characteristics

Information supplied by each school was used to determine the distribution and relative frequency of student home schools. Ethnic data was obtained from the same source.

E. Teacher Perceptions

A teacher questionnaire was developed to elicit teacher opinion concerning the degree to which the program was successful in fulfilling its original aims. In addition, open-ended questions were asked regarding components of the program that they viewed as positive

* Behavioral Research Laboratories, Palo Alto, California, 94302

or negative. Recommendations for changes were also solicited. The questionnaire was responded to by 28 regular teachers. The format is reproduced in Appendix A.

F. Interviews and Observations

A total of eight visits were made during the course of the five week program at each of the two participating schools. The visits were designed to determine the actual structure of the program, professional roles, disseminate and collect data, and interview staff and administrative personnel. Specifically, an attempt was made to determine.

1. Staffing procedures and teacher characteristics.

2. Function of Educational Assistants and School Aides.

3. Characteristics, materials and techniques used in the reading, mathematics and Language Arts programs.

4. Teaching English as a Second Language - same as 3.

5. Library Program - same as 3.

6. Student evaluation, recognition and follow up procedures as practiced in the program.

V. Results of the Evaluation

A. Personnel

1. Teachers

The teaching staff in the SDES was hired in conformity with the seniority provision of the Board of Education contract with the United Federation of Teachers. Teachers were hired under what is generally known as Retention Rights. Under this concept seniority takes precedence. Teachers with two consecutive years teaching experience in any program (in this case SDES) have first call on the positions when the program is recycled. Altogether the program employed 30 teachers: 26 classroom teachers, 2 librarians and 2 English as a Second Language teachers; 19 were assigned to PS 20 while PS 137 had 11.

For the most part, the teachers were experienced and familiar with the community and students of District I. PS 137 had an exceptionally experienced staff. All had at least 5 years experience in previous SDES programs and were therefore able to function immediately at the outset of the program. The other school, however, had several staff difficulties in the initial stages of the program. Five teachers for various reasons resigned just prior to the beginning of the program. Several replacements for one reason or another were considered less than satisfactory for the positions for which they were hired. This resulted in further changes in the program well into its second week.

Ultimately these changes resulted in the elimination and redistribution of a first and third grade class and the addition of a sixth grade class. In addition two teachers were assigned to teach a fifth grade which was felt by the administrator to be over enrolled (register - 36 children). It was generally felt that these changes were disruptive in nature and tended to impede the operation of the program in its first several weeks.

While this situation was indeed unfortunate, the matter was further complicated this year by the elimination of a scheduled teacher orientation day or provisions for staff meetings. Since nine of the seventeen classroom teachers were new to the SDES at PS 20, they arrived the first day of classes in many instances without materials and an unfamiliarity with the scope and operation of the program. Even at PS 137 where the staff was quite experienced a need was felt for some form of orientation and staff discussion time.* It was in no small measure due to the hard work of the office and administrative personnel that the first day's program managed to function as well as it did.

2. Educational Assistants

Each class was staffed with an Educational Assistant who helped the teacher perform classroom duties. The aides had worked in this capacity at their respective schools during the regular school year and had been chosen for the SDES assignments by their principals. They worked with small groups of individual students in class, helped decorate the room, distribute materials, help keep order when necessary. Their work was viewed favorably by the teachers. Altogether 28 classroom assistants were hired; 17 at PS 20 and 11 at PS 137.

3. School Aides

Both schools employed the services of School Aides (three at PS 20 and two at PS 137). Their duties included miscellaneous school work such as answering telephones, relaying messages and delivering materials to the classroom teachers. As with the Educational Assistants, they worked at their job during the regular school year and were experienced in their routine.

4. School Secretary

Each school employed the services of a School Secretary who worked three hours per day. Their duties included typing, answering telephones, running off dittos and miscellaneous clerical work. At PS 137 the three hour time schedule was considered adequate. However in view of the large enrollment and the greater multiplicity of work at PS 20, this time allocation was not considered satisfactory by the administrator. The secretary felt hard pressed to complete her assignments and in many instances work was left undone or completed on her own time. Strong consideration should therefore, be given to either increasing the daily time schedule for the school secretary at PS 20 or employing the services of another secretary.

---

* Voluntary staff meetings were conducted by the administration prior to the beginning of the program.

B. The Educational Program

1. Reading Program

While each school concentrated quite heavily on teaching reading, there were distinct methodological differences perceptible in each program. PS 137 relied almost exclusively on the "programmed" instruction technique of the Sullivan Reading materials. The advantages of this technique for this sort of program according to the principal are: 1) the materials are novel in that they were not used in previous reading instruction for these children during the regular school year; 2) they permit an easy and relatively accurate determination of beginning, reading level; 3) constant checks provide an accurate appraisal of progress and final reading level; 4) they are non-consumable and can be used again next year. The main disadvantage of this approach is that the materials do not go beyond the 6.3 grade level and that with constant repetition the program can become dull and uninteresting. To counter these potential drawbacks supplementary and enrichment reading materials were provided such as Reader's Digest.

At PS 20 a more conventional approach to reading was taken in which a wide variety of materials were made available. In the lower levels reading readiness and pre primer materials were used. Reliance on basal readers, SRA reading kits and rexograph materials was more noticeable in the upper grades.

While this approach was beneficial in providing a wide range of materials potentially more suitable to the interests of the students, it would appear to lack several of the advantages associated with the programmed material. Student initial reading level while relying on an informal test technique is subject to too much error in judgement. Also student progress and final reading level estimates suffer from the same drawback. If the adoption of a programmed technique may be financially or philosophically difficult to adopt the program at PS 20 might consider utilizing one of many diagnostic reading tests currently available, on a pre and post test basis. In this way the need for accurate measurement would blend well with desire for a wide range of instructional materials.

2. Mathematics Program

Mathematics was stressed to a greater degree this year than in past years at both schools. Program methodologies followed the same dichotomy existing in the area of reading. At PS 137 the Sullivan Program materials were used under the same rationale. The program was supplemented by using a variety of number games, number puzzles, and teacher inventions to provide a greater variety of materials and promote student interest for mathematics.

At PS 20 teachers used neither performance tests nor programmed instruction. While some teachers used textbooks, the primary materials for most classrooms consisted of teacher-made materials, number games and puzzles. While these in many cases appeared quite good, this technique suffered from the same lack of precision associated with the reading program. It might also benefit the mathematics program to employ a simple form diagnostic test in the same way described for the reading program.

3. Language Arts Program

The Language Arts program was the least formalized aspect of the SDES. While formal grammar was taught in some classes, particular stress was placed in each school on relating other aspects of the curriculum to the Language Arts program. The students were encouraged to write poems, create puzzles and games. These were collected each week and circulated in the schools. At PS 20 this took the form of a bulletin; at 137, a school newspaper. Students were encouraged to read the works of their fellow students and to contribute in turn to the newsletter.

The puzzles, word games, jumbles, poems, etc. that were observed were creative and interesting. The observer felt that the program was successful in encouraging language as an activity and communication medium, rather than as a subject to be studied.

4. Teaching English as A Second Language

Both schools were provided this year with the services of a TESL teacher. For 137 this represented an additional service over last year's program.

The TESL program was designed to accommodate children who speak English poorly and are in need of remedial help either in comprehension or improving pronunciation. Approximately 42 students were served by the program (17 at PS 20 and 25 at 137). While most of the students were Spanish speaking, a good number were Oriental.

The TESL program at PS 20 was structured as a self-contained classroom unit. Students identified at registration as in need of the TESL program were assigned to the class and stayed for the entire program. While this probably reduced the number of students the program could reach, the self-contained environment was felt to result in greater language gains for the students who did participate.

Students selected for the TESL program were rated before and after the program using the New York City Board of Education Scale of Pupil's Ability to Speak English. The results showed that 6 of the 17 enrollees showed one level gain on that scale.

The class made use of a variety of materials and techniques including some basal reading materials. Major emphasis, however, was placed on acquiring names for objects (days of the week, clothing, family, etc.) and simple conversation. Students worked drawings, paintings, used flashcards and word games. In general the class appeared well organized and properly conducted.

The program at 137 functioned as a special class. All students were assigned a class. These students identified by either the classroom or TESL teacher as in need of the bilingual services met separately for brief periods of time in small groups.

The classes functioned in an informal but seemingly effective way. The teacher used games to stimulate conversation and provide motivation. After the game an experience chart was developed by the class, concerning the events of the game. Finally, students were encouraged to rewrite their experiences in the session.

Other materials included an Audio Flash Reader, tape recorder, filmstrips and record player. The students seemed to respond positively to the variety of materials and the intimacy of the small group sessions.

5. Library Program

Both schools were provided this year with the services of a librarian. For 137 this represented an additional service over last year's program.

The program was very similar to a typical library program offered during the school year. Students 1-6 met generally one period per week. This period was used to:

1) instruct children in the use of the library
2) select books and periodicals for reading enjoyment
3) select books relevant to ongoing classroom activities.

Students were encouraged to use the library. Special times were set aside for browsing, selecting and returning books. Weekly circulation figures provided by the librarians are included below.

FIGURE I

SDES LIBRARY CIRCULATION RATE BY SCHOOL

WEEK	PS 20	PS 137	Total
1	78	151	229
2	259	189	448
3	252	177	429
4	264	80	344
5	268	-	268
Total	1121	597	1718

6. Music Program

PS 20 employed this year the two instrumental teachers. These taught instrumental music to a fifth and sixth grade class on a regularly assigned basis. The program culminated with a performance given as part of an assembly for students and parents at the end of the session.

It would appear that the inclusion of this form of instruction into a remedial educational program is inappropriate. The rationale most often given to the observer was that the teaching of reading, language arts and mathematics was an intrinsic aspect of music instruction. Music instruction would thereby improve the students "academic skills." Unfortunately since neither class measured their students in any academic area, this assertion went untested.

The SDES program was originally funded to provide remedial instruction in basic academic areas. No matter how desirous a music program might happen to be, it must conform to the original objectives of the program. It is therefore suggested that the music component of the SDES program test their students on objective standardized measures of achievement; or that this aspect be eliminated and the resources redirected back into the original purpose of the program.

C. Student Evaluation

1. Attendance

Good attendance was valued quite highly by both schools in the program. Students were encouraged to attend classes. Excessive absences were reported to the offices where attempts were made to con-

tact the home. Students with excellent attendance received honor certificates and were recognized at award assemblies given at the end of the program. Each student's attendance record was forwarded to his regular school for their use.

Attendance data was collected from 25 of the 26 classes in the program or for 603 students in both schools. It was the program's objective that at least 80% of the students should attend 60% or more of the class sessions. Since many students did not register for the full 25 sessions, attendance percentage was computed by dividing the number of days for which the student was registered in the program into the number of days attended. The results show that 84% of the students in both schools had an attendance rate of 60% or more. Tables 6 and 7 contain a summary of data concerning attendance.

Table 4: SUMMARY OF ATTENDANCE DATA OF SDES PROGRAM

VARIABLE	PS 20	PS 137	Total
# of classes in program	17	9	26
# of classes reporting attendance	17	8	25
# of students for whom attendance was reported	436	167	603
# of students with attendance rate of 60% or more	386	132	514
% of students with attendance rate of 60% or more	88%*	80%*	84%*

* Program attendance objective met.

2. Achievement

Instruction was concentrated mainly in reading and mathematics. While some time was devoted to other language arts, in each school, it was not a major aspect of the program.

Attempts were made at each school to maintain an ongoing evaluation of student progress. At PS 20 students were to take home some evidence of work which was corrected each day. In some classes at home assignments were given to students at PS 137. Weekly evaluation of student achievement was conducted at PS 20 while PS 137 used the evaluations built into the Sullivan system. Students in both schools who made excellent achievement (in any area) were awarded an honor certificate and recognized at the final assembly. A final evaluation was kept on file at the SDES schools and forwarded to the students' regular school.

The program objectives for both reading and mathematics programs were for 80% of the students to improve their reading skills by .2 grade equivalent units. The results show that the overall program was successful in achieving that objective, one school failed to attain the 80% level.

a. Reading Achievement

A sample of 493 students distributed across the grades 1-6 was used to determine whether 80% of the students gained .2 or more years in reading achievement. Since each school differed in terms of class arrangement and measurement instrument it was decided to analyze each school separately.

PS 137, using the programmed instruction of the Sullivan materials, supplied data for 155 students. Figures show that 138 of 89% were rated as gaining .2 grade equivalent units or more during the five week program. In this respect PS 137 was successful in meeting the program objective. PS 20 supplied reading information for 338 students. Students were rated by their teachers using an open book, informal reading test. Information acquired in this manner show 265 students or 78% of the students gained .2 grade equivalents while in the program. Combined, both schools show 403 out of 493 or 82% of the students in the program gained .2 grade equivalent units. Table 7 shows a summary of reading achievement data.

Table 5: STUDENTS OF SDES IMPROVING .2 GRADE EQUIVALENTS IN READING

SCHOOL	# OF STUDENTS	% OF STUDENTS
PS 20	265	78%
PS 137	138	89%*
Total SDES	403	82%*

* Program achievement objective met.

An analysis was also done to show the extent of change for each school by grade level. Since each school used different criteria for formulating classes and because of the differences in measurement techniques direct comparisons are not totally appropriate. Table 8 gives average change for each school.

The school using the Sullivan materials provided information easily convertible to G.E. However in the other school, using the open book technique the assessment of change was less exact because of the presence of many reading readiness, and pre-primer materials. It was decided in this case that children who were working at reading readiness, pre-primer I, or pre-primer II would be scored dichotomously. 1 if they improve 1 level or more, 0 if they did not change level. A change of 1 level would have been considered as having met the .2 criterion.

Table 6: DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE CHANGE AND PRE-POST READING SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL FOR EACH SDES SCHOOL

PS 137 N = 155

	1.2	2.3	3	3.4	4.5	5	5.6	6	6.7
PRE	*	.9	1.7	1.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	2.3	5.0
POST	*	1.4	2.0	3.1	4.1	4.1	4.4	2.8	6.8
CHANGE (AVG.)	*	.50	.41	1.31	.49	.48	.67	.53	1.8

* information not provided

PS 20 N = 338

	1	2	3	4	5	6
PRE	*	*	*	3.7	3.5	4.0
POST	*	*		3.9	4.0	4.2
CHANGE (AVG.)	.23	.29	* .21	.22	.50	.28

* Cannot be calculated exactly because of presence of many readiness and pre-primer levels.

b. Mathematics Achievement

Mathematics achievement was computed on the same basis as reading achievement. Data was collected for 497 students distributed across grades 1-6. At PS 137 data was computed in terms of the Sullivan Mathematics materials, while at PS 20 information was provided through more informal teacher assessment. The results in each case show that 65% of the students gained .2 grade equivalent units while in the program. This is well below the program objective of 80%. Table 9 provides a summary of mathematics achievement in terms of the .2 grade equivalent level.

Table 7: STUDENTS OF SDES IMPROVING .2 GRADE EQUIVALENTS IN MATHEMATICS

SCHOOL	# OF STUDENTS	% OF STUDENTS
PS 20	227	65%
PS 137	97	65%
TOTAL - SDES	324	65%

Table 10 shows the distribution of average change in mathematics by grade level for both schools in the program. Since the schools differed again in classroom structure and assessment procedures, cross school comparisons are not appropriate. Nevertheless the distributions do provide some idea of average class progress.

Table 8: DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE CHANGE AND PRE-POST MATHEMATICS SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL FOR BOTH SDES SCHOOLS.

PS 137 N = 147

	1	2.3	3	3.4	4.5	5	5.6	6	6.7
PRE	*	.9	1.8	2.0	3.4	3.5	4.9	1.5	4.7
POST	*	1.0	1.9	2.5	3.6	3.6	5.2	1.8	5.9
CHANGE (AUG)	*	.10	.10	.55	.27	.12	.33	.27	1.27

* information not provided

PS 20 N = 350

	1	2	3	4	5	6
PRE	1.5	1.3	2.2	3.8	3.8	3.6
POST	1.8	1.5	2.4	4.1	4.2	3.9
CHANGE (AUG)	.26	.27	.21	.24	.40	.30

D. Discussion of Achievement Data

Results show that the overall program was successful in achieving the reading objective set for the program. It was not successful in achieving the mathematics objective. One school failed to make the objective in either the reading or mathematics area; while the other school was successful in the reading area but not the math.

There are several reasons which might account for these differences in achievement scores. The first is class size. PS 137 had an average class size of approximately 21 (reported range 16-23). The other school had a rather high class average of approximately 27 students (reported range 18-38). At one point in the program,* it was observed that a first grade had a class register of 44; 2 third grades had enrollments of 35 and 32; 2 fifth grade classes had registers of 36 and 38.

For a program such as SDES, designed to provide short term, individualized remedial instruction such enrollment figures are not to be tolerated. Teachers, no matter how capable, cannot provide the sort of intensive instruction necessary for students already in academic difficulty. It is recommended that class size, particularly at PS 20 be greatly reduced.

* An on site inspection of classrooms made by the observer on 7/18/72.

The second difference in achievement levels may be accounted for the differences in which students were evaluated. The informal reading test relied upon by one school is a crude measure at best for a program seeking to measure change in terms of months. While such procedures might function well for classroom instruction, it is too intuitive and relies too much on teacher judgement to be considered a successful measurement instrument. While the school using the programmed materials was more objective in this sense, results are still subject to error which may be built into the program. It is recommended that both schools select a simple diagnostic test and administer it to all students on a pre-post basis for each curriculum area. In this way errors associated with teacher evaluation might be held to a minimum.

The third factor accounting for achievement differences might be the types of materials used. Since funds for instructional materials were limited, the program was forced to concentrate on obtaining materials which would not efficiently meet the needs of the students.

The programmed materials used at one school had an advantage in providing consistent goal oriented activity for the students each day, at a relatively low cost. Supplementing the "program" with teacher classroom work appeared to lessen the boredom which is often associated with this form of instruction. The other school, however, was less committed to a particular form of instructional materials. This lack of commitment, it is felt, had to a certain amount inefficiency in the purchasing of materials in terms of their impact on students.

For example, several classrooms were supplied with whole sets of Childcraft Books as classroom enrichment materials. They appeared little used. Sullivan materials were purchased on such a limited basis the program had little effect. Mathematics materials in particular seemed most inconsistent in terms of day to day student activities.

It is therefore recommended that the program commit itself to a particular form of instructional materials (programmed instruction, basal workbook, etc.) and make the necessary purchases.

E. Teacher Perceptions of the Program

As part of the evaluation procedures, teachers were asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to determine their perceptions concerning the overall functioning of the program.

More specifically the program assessed: 1) how successful the SDES was in meeting the aims for the program; 2) the reading program's effectiveness; 3) the math program's effectiveness; 4) the language arts program's effectiveness; 5) the adequacy of the Educational Assistants' help; 6) effectiveness of the administration; 7) positive features of the program; 8) negative features of the program; and 9) recommendations for program improvement. The entire questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A. 28 out of 30 teachers in the program responded to the questionnaire, a return rate of 93%.

The data in Table 11 summarizes teacher opinion concerning the program.

Table 9: PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS IN SDES PROGRAM EVALUATING THE PROGRAM AS GENERALLY EFFECTIVE OR EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE IN VARIOUS COMPONENTS

COMPONENT	N = 28	% EVALUATING AT GENERALLY EFFECTIVE OR EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE
A. Program Aims (Meeting of)		
1. Remedial help in academics		100%
2. Appreciation of need for school		100%
3. Appreciation of minority cultures		80%
4. Arts & Crafts		47%
B. Effectiveness of Reading Program		
1. Materials		85%
2. Appreciation for reading		96%
3. Teaching reading skills		85%
4. Motivating independent reading		96%
C. Effectiveness of Math Program		
1. Materials		74%
2. Math in everyday life		82%
3. Teaching math skills		90%
D. Effectiveness of Language Arts Program		
1. Materials		85%
2. Encouraging originality		70%
3. Written and spoken facility		92%
E. Educational Assistants		
1. Help in planning		77%
2. Classroom activities		96%
3. Housekeeping		96%
4. Keeping order		88%
F. Administration		
1. Staff communications		96%
2. Guidance and professional advice		96%
3. Supplying curriculum materials		96%

The results from the questionnaire indicate a generally positive attitude of the teachers to the SDES program.

The questionnaire asked the teachers to respond to the perceived positive and negative aspects of the program and to offer possible recommendations.

The most often mentioned positive aspect of the program was the informal relaxed atmosphere of the program. The opportunity to provide individualized instruction was mentioned next. The most negative aspects of the program according to the teachers, were the large class sizes and shortness of the program. Class size was mentioned in particular by 10 teachers at PS 20. Nine teachers felt the five week program was too short and that it should be lengthened to six weeks as it was in past years. Eight teachers expressed a need for an orientation for teachers at the beginning of the program.

Teacher recommendations included apart from smaller class size and longer program additional materials, particularly in the mathematics area. Other recommendations mentioned were to halt registration after the first week of the program and for teacher orientation time.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Conclusions

1. The attendance objective was successfully met. Overall figures showed 84% of the students had an attendance rate of 60 per cent or more. The two schools yielded individual figures of 80 and 88 per cent.

2. The program was successful in meeting the reading objective of 80 percent of the students improving their reading skills by .2 grade equivalents. Results show that 82 per cent of the students in the total program met this level. The figures for the two schools individually were 89 and 78 per cent, a rather substantial difference.

3. The mathematics objective was not met by either school. Both schools reported 65 per cent of the students as having gained .2 grade equivalent units or more. The original objective was for 80 percent of the students to reach this level.

B. Recommendations

A program providing the students of District I, Manhattan with remedial, individualized instruction during the summer months is greatly needed. It is, therefore, recommended that the program be recycled and that attention be paid to the recommendations listed below:

1. Class size for the program was too high. The program was originally designed to accommodate 480 students. It enrolled just under 650. This compromised the program's effectiveness. Either registration should be limited to the first 480 students who register or, if the need is great enough, additional teachers should be hired. Ultimate considerations might be given to expanding the program into another school.

2. One or two registration days prior to the beginning of the program should be reestablished. Having students register the first day class begins places serious burdens on the administrative staff and disrupts the initial classroom sessions.

3. Much classroom continuity was lost by allowing students to register and leave in the middle of the program. SDES enrollment should therefore be limited to the first week of the program.

4. Final approval for the program should be accomplished much earlier in the year. Late approval this year caused several difficulties regarding the acquisition of personnel and the purchasing of materials.

5. A teacher orientation session, particularly for new teachers ought to be reestablished prior to the beginning of the program. Possible provisions ought to be made for at least one staff meeting during the program.

6. The hours of the school secretary at PS 20 should be increased by at least one hour per day in order to accommodate her great work load.

7. Academic assessment would be made easier and more reliable through the use of standardized diagnostic tests. It is recommended the program select reading and mathematics tests to be used on pre-post basis.

8. Greater emphasis should be placed on the efficient acquisition of appropriate materials particularly for the mathematics program.

9. The music component at PS 20, though desirable, does not conform to the objectives set for the program and diverts many of the program's limited resources. It is therefore recommended that this component be discontinued and that the classes be set up on an academic basis.

APPENDIX A

The following questions are designed to elicit your response concerning the Summer Day Elementary School Program. Kindly circle the number which best describes how you feel toward the question. You may use the criteria listed below:

1. Extremely effective - almost total success - all needs met.
2. Generally effective - often times successful, however, not everything just right.
3. Undecided - equally disappointing and satisfactory.
4. Generally ineffective - clearly more incidents ineffective than effective.
5. Extremely ineffective - almost total disappointment.

1. How well do you think Summer Day Elementary School was successful in meeting the aims for the program?

   a) providing remedial help in reading, math and language arts 1 2 3 4 5

   b) appreciation of the need for school 1 2 3 4 5

   c) appreciation of minority cultures 1 2 3 4 5

   d) arts and crafts 1 2 3 4 5

2. How effective was the reading program in:

   a) providing an adequate supply and variety of reading materials 1 2 3 4 5

   b) leading to an appreciation for reading 1 2 3 4 5

   c) acquiring necessary reading skills 1 2 3 4 5

   d) motivating children to read independently 1 2 3 4 5

3. How effective was the math program in:

   a) providing an adequate supply and variety of materials 1 2 3 4 5

   b) gaining an appreciation for math in every-day life 1 2 3 4 5

   c) acquiring necessary math skills 1 2 3 4 5

4. How effective was the language arts program in:

   a) providing an adequate supply and variety of materials 1 2 3 4 5

   b) encouraging originality in creative writing 1 2 3 4 5

   c) increasing both written and spoken facility 1 2 3 4 5

5. How well did the Education Assistants help in:

   a) planning classroom activities 1 2 3 4 5

   b) participating in classroom activities 1 2 3 4 5

   c) distributing materials and arranging classroom 1 2 3 4 5

   d) keeping order in the classroom 1 2 3 4 5

6. How effective was the administration in:

   a) adequately communicating with the staff 1 2 3 4 5

   b) providing classroom "guidance" and professional advice 1 2 3 4 5

   c) helping with curricular materials

7. In your opinion, what were the most positive features of the program?

8. What were the most negative aspects of the program?

9. What recommendations would you make to improve the program?

Function No. 33-3-1608

HOMEWORK HELPER PROGRAM

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR:	LOUIS HOFMANN, PH.D.
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	MARSHA PALMER
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE:	PATRICIA DUTMERS

I. Introduction

The Summer 1972 Homework Helper is a recycled program which has been operative in its present form for several years. This Summer's program was conducted from July 5 to August 8 in thirteen centers located throughout District I. The Elementary Centers were at P.S. 15, 19, 34, 61, 63, 64, 97, 134, 140, and 188. The Junior High School Centers were at J.H.S. 22, 56, and 71.

The program staff consisted of one Director, thirteen master teachers, twenty-six educational assistants, twenty-six college tutors, and over two hundred other tutors. The director estimated that nearly six hundred students attended some tutoring sessions during the five week program.

The tutors were recruited prior to the beginning of the program and orientation sessions for the staff were held on June 27, 28, and 29. Because the program was expanded from nine centers to thirteen during June and July, all the centers were not completely staffed until the second week of the program. Another problem arose because this year college students were recruited as teachers. Some of these students did apparently change their plans and did not attend their orientation sessions. The replacement of these tutors also lead to a small delay in implementing the program.

The following objectives served to orient the program activities:*

a) to assist students in attaining normal age-grade achievement through individual instruction
b) to prevent students from failing in school
c) to give held over students a second chance to be promoted
d) to assist high school and college students in the completion of their college or high school programs
e) to provide models for tutored pupils

II. History of the Homework Helper Program

In the early 1960's, concern for juvenile delinquency led to the formulation of Mobilization for Youth, a composite of thirteen programs designed to redirect more constructively the energies of New York City Youth. The thrust of Mobilization for Youth was to provide employment for teenagers, thereby giving them leadership opportunities other than those provided by gang membership. One of these thirteen programs developed was the Homework Helper Program, in which teenagers were hired at the rate of $1.50 an hour to tutor younger children in reading and mathematics.

Originally, the criteria for selection as a tutor in the program included economic need, satisfactory school work, recommendations of teachers and guidance counselors, and no more than one year's retardation in reading achievement. Such criteria did not result in reaching the population for which the program was originally intended. Those who were alienated from participation in school leadership activities,

*extracted and modified from reports of director and master teachers

were dropping out of school and joining gangs, and were often more than one year behind in school achievement. Increasingly, evidence was compiled that showed it was not so much the level of educational achievement attained by the tutor, but rather the relationship he established with the student that was the biggest factor in success in learning to read. As this became recognized the criteria for selection as a tutor were altered so that two, and later three years, of reading achievement retardation became the norm and the composite body of tutors began to resemble more closely the population for which the program was originally intended -- the alienated teenager.

The program enrollment in 1962-63 included 110 tutors, and 300 students who were in nine schools throughout New York City. The following year the number rose to 330 tutors and 700 students with eleven school centers until 1969, when 150 schools were operating Homework Helper Centers.

City-wide decentralization in the fall of 1967 had quite an impact on the organizational structure of the program. Until that time, Dr. Albert Deering had been the coordinator of the program and was involved with helping to staff and equip the centers, providing some uniformity among centers and adhering to the original design which provided nearly a one-to-one relationship between tutor and student. Following decentralization, Dr. Deering became a resource person, with administrative responsibility shifting to district leaders who were free to select, reject, or modify the existing program. Many districts chose to stay with the program, continuing to adhere to the original intent, while others dropped the program entirely, changed the programs' name, or increased the ratio between tutors and students so that the nature of instruction shifted to small groups rather than individual. In other districts acceptance of responsibility for the program spurred careful and conscientious program implementation. At any rate, decentralization put control over the program in the hands of the district coordinators.

In 1969, two more changes took place. A field staff was added and placed under the direction of Dr. Deering and the program was broadened to include centers in junior high schools and high schools where, formerly, the Homework Helper Program had been only in elementary schools. At this point, operation of the elementary and junior high centers was carried on almost exclusively by district personnel, Dr. Deering, and the new field staff concentrated their efforts on developing the high school centers.

While the purpose of the Homework Helper Centers remained the same for elementary, junior high and senior high schools, there are still some differences in the character of the programs. In elementary school and junior high schools, focus is on reading and mathematics skills and a firmly established and somewhat long-term relationship between tutor and student. The program population is fairly stable, with most students participating for at least one school year. In the high schools, however, the centers are being utilized for more specific short-term needs, such as an intensive content review in algebra or biology. This being the case, the program population shows a high rate of turnover, and it becomes increasingly difficult to evaluate the success of the program in terms of achievement level gains. Most requests for tutorial assistance in the high school centers are for the content areas of mathematics and foreign languages.

During the course of its ten year history, numerous evaluations have been made of the Homework Helper Program. Following is a review of the theory behind the program's design as well as a review of studies conducted to assess the strengths of the Homework Helper Program.

Prior Evaluations of the Program

Little was known about the efficacy of employing non-professional tutors to assist children who have fallen behind in their reading before the advent of the Homework Helper Program in New York City in 1963. Most educators assumed that the problems of the retarded reader from a disadvantaged home were so complex that only professionally trained reading specialists could be of assistance. Salzman points out, however, that among social workers and educators who have worked in slum-area schools, there was a growing belief that important contributions to the educational development of culturally disadvantaged children could be made by other young people whose life experiences provide a basis for empathy with the population being served. According to this view, the young tutor's ability to understand and communicate with low achieving children in his social and economic group help to compensate for the tutor's lack of a higher education and knowledge of teaching methods.

Cloward evaluated a program that featured the employment of high school students in a slum area as tutors for low-achieving public elementary school pupils. This was part of a demonstration tutorial project which was conducted in New York, jointly sponsored by Mobilization for Youth and the Board of Education. Eleven tutorial centers were established in neighborhood elementary schools and two hundred forty students from local academic and vocational high schools were hired to tutor five hundred forty-four fourth and fifth grade pupils. Each Center was directed by a master teacher who,in addition to administrative activities, was responsible for training the tutors. For purposes of evaluation, tutors and tutees eligible for the program were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. Experimental pupils were tutored either once or twice a week for two hours. The results of the study show that after five months of tutorial instruction, pupils in the four-hour treatment group showed significantly greater improvement in reading ability than did control subjects with an average of six months' reading improvement in five months' time. During this same period, the control pupils showed only three and a half months' growth. The two-hour treatment group made a gain of five months in reading during the five-month period, which also exceeded the gain of the controls, but the difference was not statistically significant.

The effect of the program on the reading ability of the tutors was also analyzed, and much to the surprise of the investigators, the program had a major effect on the reading achievement of the tutors. The tutors showed an average gain in reading of three years, four months, as compared with one year, seven months for the control subjects. In addition, the data for the tutors as well as for the pupils indicated that the effects of the experimental treatment were maximized for subjects with initially low reading skill. Although no significant differences were found between tutors and their controls on before and after measures of school grades (teacher evaluations), the author speculates that the

high reading gains made by the tutors may well enable them to earn higher marks in their future school work. At any rate, it is clear that service as a tutor did not adversely affect school achievement.

Two substudies were conducted in an attempt to establish guidelines for the selection of future tutors. The data of these studies led the author to conclude that pupil reading gain was not related to or influenced by the demographic, intellectual, or attitudinal characteristics of their tutors.

It is clear from these findings, that tutors do not need twelve years of formal education and extensive training in reading pedagogy to be effective. They do not even need to be highly successful in their own school work. Apparently, the average high school student can learn to be an effective tutor for the elementary school child.

Contrary to expectations, high school students are effective tutors with pupils who are severely retarded in reading. Cloward suggests that these are the youngsters who, because of their unsatisfactory progress in school, have come to expect ridicule, rejection and continued failure. Teachers tend to regard these children as a burden, and are reluctant to spend class time in an attempt to teach them the basic skills that they failed to learn in earlier grades. In a tutorial situation, where emphasis is placed on individual attention and basic skill training, these youngsters can make substantital progress in reading.

Since the major impact of the tutorial experience was on the tutors themselves, this finding has implications for both education and youth employment. Tutorial programs not only can provide older youth in a low-income area with gainful employment, but can serve to upgrade their academic skills as well. Indeed, the high reading gains made by tutors who were reading far below grade level at the beginning of the study raise the question of whether high school drop-outs might be successfully employed as tutors, not just to help underachieving elementary-school pupils, but to improve their <u>own</u> academic skills. Having experienced failure and humiliation in the classroom and being alienated from school, these youngsters tend to rebel against learning situations in which they are cast in the role of a student. Assigning tutorial roles to such adolescents might help to make learning enjoyable and profitable for them, as well as to give them an experience of "success."

All other reports of the New York City Homework Helper Program show similar positive results for both tutor and tutee. As of December 1969, there were one hundred centers operating in New York City, serving one thousand five hundred tutors and four thousand five hundred elementary and high school age tutees. The tutees appear to be benefitting in two ways, both by receiving individual

help in basic skills and study habits, which enables them to upgrade their academic skills, and by the opportunity to identify with a positive role model offered by the tutor. The tutor is gaining in several ways too. Payment to tutors of $1.50 to $2.00 an hour may enable them to remain in school; their reading levels are going up; and finally, the tutorial experience may motivate them towards improved academic achievement and the choice of a career in teaching.

A somewhat different Homework Helper Program is being carried out in Sacramento, California. There, study centers were set up in churches and other host agencies, and college students were recruited and trained as volunteer (unpaid) tutors. The outstanding result of this program so far has been in the field of human understanding. The centers are supervised and staffed by persons of all races. For many of the tutors, this is their first opportunity to meet and work with each other on an equal basis, particularly in the case of Caucasian and Negro. Mutual respect and admiration has developed which, hopefully, will serve to make these college tutors more understanding and effective in their future roles as teachers, social workers, sociologists, community leaders and citizens. In addition, the tutors report that they find the experience of working with the children a most rewarding way for the tutor to develop insight and understanding into the world of the culturally different and low socio-economic child which will be invaluable to them later on.

III. Evaluation Design

The evaluation focused on five Homework Helper Centers. Data was gathered to determine the extent to which the program was achieving the following behavioral objectives.

A. To raise the reading level of the tutored students by .2 grade equivalent units.

B. To raise the educational aspirations of 75% of the tutored students.

C. To assist 80% of the tutors in staying in school.

Visits were made to each of the five sample centers and achievement and attitude information was collected from 81 tutors who worked in the five sample centers, the achievement tests which were administered at the beginning and end of the program were also collected and analyzed.

IV. Results

A. General Observations of the Programs

Five centers were selected for on-site observations. In all cases the pupils interviewed were extremely enthusiastic about the program, some indicating that they would have liked to attend both the split sessions which ran from 9 to 11 A.M., and from 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. This enthusiasm was thoroughly shared by the tutors and staff who were interviewed. Great emphasis was placed on displaying examples of student work. This interest in student performance was one element which was responsible for the enthusiasm of the tutors and pupils.

Many of the schools were very warm and uncomfortable during the Summer session. While nothing can probably be done to change this situation, student interest and motivation were very high even with this impediment and this fact attests strongly to the appropriateness and meaningfulness of this program in the lives of these students.

B. Tutor's Reactions to the Program

During the last week of the Summer program the tutors were asked to respond to two questions which elicited their long term educational aspirations and plans. Of the fifty-six tutors who responded to the question "If you were free to go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you go?" ninety two percent of them would like to go to college for some period or go even further. Thirty-four percent even liking to go to graduate school for some period.

When asked how far they really expected to go, eighty-seven percent believed that they would go to college or beyond. While it cannot be asserted that participation in this program produced such high motivational levels, these tutors may have benefitted greatly from these teaching experiences, and the objective of assisting eighty percent of these tutors in remaining in schools seems to have been met.

The tutors were also asked several questions about their participation in the program. Their responses are summarized below.

1. Tutors became interested in becoming tutors mainly through friends and through their enjoyment of children and teaching.

2. The tutors prepared for each tutoring session mainly by holding planning sessions each day.

3. The tutors choose the materials to be used in the individual tutoring sessions.

4. The tutors rely primarily on testing for determining the level of difficulty of tutoring materials.

5. The tutors feel that the most important roles they play are: establishing good relationships with students; motivating students to work on their own; and helping students develop self confidence.

6. The tutors regard working individually with students as more satisfying to them than the salary they receive or the reactions of students to them as tutors.

7. When asked how the program could be improved, the most frequent suggestions were:

a. raising salaries
b. having more materials available
c. getting better tutors
d. having private tutoring spaces
e. having more educational trips

It is not surprising that the salary earned was the least satisfying to the students, because the most frequent suggestion was the raising of salaries.

C. Students Reactions to the Program

1. General Reactions

In order to assess the tutored students reactions to the program, questionnaires were administered to one hundred and thirty students.

The students were encouraged to come to the program almost entirely by parents and teachers, with friends and counselors almost not being influential at all. About sixty percent of the students listed their parents as helping them decide to come to the center. When asked whether they would prefer doing something other than coming to the center, fewer than fifty percent listed any other activities.

Similarly when asked how much help the program had given to them, eighty-five percent chose "very much" as a response. Only three students said that the program was "not very much" help to them.

The students apparently even worked on some of the lesson material at home. Nearly fifty percent indicated that they took work home with them.

The students had several suggestions to make regarding the improvement of the program. The most frequent suggestions were:

a. more trips
b. more tutors
c. snacks
d. more books
e. more time in the program
f. better lunches
g. and thirteen students suggested that they should receive more work

2. Attendance of Students

The director of the program indicated that the average attendance of tutors and of the students were both above ninety percent. This attendance is consistent with the overall student and tutor reaction to the program.

3. Changes in Student Educational Aspirations and Plans

In order to assess changes in student's educational aspirations and plans, questionnaires were administered to a sample of students at the beginning and the end of the program. Because the student sample was not the same, at the two periods, no determination of whether 80% of the students changed their aspirations in the positive direction was possible. The analysis focused on the mean aspiration level on the two testing periods.

Question number nine (see Appendix B) on the student questionnaire asked how far the student would like to go in school. The alternatives were from "I'd like to quit right now," to "I'd like to finish college." The responses were scaled from one to six. The mean on the pretest was 5.0 and the mean on the post-test was 5.4. This change was not statistically significant ($t = + 1.19$) but was in the positive direction. A similar question on "plans" yielded similar results. The mean on the pretest was 4.5 and the post-test 5.0 ($t = 1.22$). While neither of these changes were statistically significant, the student's pretest responses were partially responsible, with a large proportion choosing the most positive response on the first occasion. This obviously put a limit on the amount of change possible.

4. Changes in Student Reading Achievement

The students in the program were mainly tutored in the language arts areas, and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered to some students at the beginning and end of the program. The results of the testing indicated that substantial changes in reading achievement occurred during the course of the program. The mean pretest score for the sample of 57 students tested on both occasions was 3.28 grade equivalent units. The mean post-test score was 3.86 grade equivalent units. This was nearly a half-year gain which was highly significant statistically ($t = 8.25$), and far exceeded the objective of .20 grade equivalent unit change. Because the median grade in school was fifth grade, the progress achieved during the Summer period was quite remarkable, compared to the achievement in reading these students had attained in the past.

V. Summary

This evaluation confirms several other previous evaluations of the Homework Helper Program which have found them to be highly beneficial academically and that participants in the program hold highly positive attitudes about the program.

The use of college level tutors seems to be a particularly advantageous strategy. They bring several new dimensions to the program and serve as excellent models for the students. Some attention should be paid to the salary schedules to make the tutors job more attractive. The expansion of this program should also be considered. This program appears to be of low cost relative to the benefits attained. An expansion to other grade levels and schools would be one possibility which should be considered.

APPENDIX A

HOMEWORK HELPER PROGRAM
DISTRICT I

A. TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE Today's Date_____

PLEASE PRINT THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

1. Name_____ _____ _____
(Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Name)

2. Your age: year_____ Month_____

3. Sex_____(1 = Male 2 = Female)

4. What is your class level? _____

5. To which Homework Helper Center were you assigned? (Circle the correct answer):

P.S. 15, P.S. 19, P.S. 34, P.S. 61, P.S. 63, P.S. 64, P.S. 97, P.S. 134, P.S. 140, P.S. 188, J.H.S. 22, J.H.S. 56, J.H.S. 71

6. When did you first join the Homework Helper Program?

Please circle the letter in front of the statement which best answers each question:

7. I would like to ask you some questions about what you wish to do and plan to do in the future.
If you were free to go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you like to go?

1. I'd like to quit right now.
2. I'd like to go to high school for a while.
3. I'd like to graduate from high school.
4. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
5. I'd like to go to college for a while.
6. I'd like to graduate from college.
7. I'd like to do graduate work beyond college.

8. Sometimes what we would like to do is not the same as what we really expect to do. How far in school do you expect you will really go?

1. I plan to quit as soon as I can.
2. I plan to continue in high school for a while.
3. I plan on graduating from high school.
4. I plan on going to secretarial or trade school.
5. I plan on going to college for a while.
6. I plan on graduating from college.
7. I plan to do graduate work beyond college.

9. If you were free to have any job you wanted after you finish your schooling, which one would you most like to have?_____.

10. Sometimes the job that a person wishes to have is not the one that he actually gets. What kind of a job do you think you really will get when you finish school?_____
_____.

APPENDIX B

SUMMER 1972

HOMEWORK HELPER PROGRAM

B. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Today's Date _____

Please fill in the following:

1. Name _____ _____ _____
(Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Name)

2. Birthday _____ _____ _____
(Month) (Day) (Year)

3. Sex Male_____ Female_____

4. Name of Present School _____

5. Grade Level _____

Please write in answers to the following questions:

6. If you could be like anyone in the world, who would you want to be like? (Write the name of the person) _____

   Who is this person? _____

7. If you were free to have any job you wanted after you finish school which one would you most like to have? _____

8. Sometimes the job that a person wishes to have is not the one that he actually gets. What kind of a job do you think you really will get when you finish school? _____

9. If you could go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you like to go?

   1. I'd like to quit right now.
   2. I'd like to go to high school for a while.
   3. I'd like to finish high school.
   4. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
   5. I'd like to go to college for a while.
   6. I'd like to finish college.

10. Sometimes what we would like to do is not the same as what we really do. How far in school do you expect you will really go?

B. STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (cont'd)

1. I plan to quit as soon as I can.
2. I plan to go to high school for a whi e.
3. I plan on graduating from high school.
4. I plan on going to secretarial or trade school.
5. I plan on going to college for a while.
6. I plan on graduating from college.

11. What kind of grades do you think you could get in Reading or English if you really tried.

1. I would pass with high grades.
2. I would pass, but it would not be easy.
3. Not sure, probably pass.
4. Not sure, probably fail.
5. I would fail, no matter how hard I tried.

12. How important is it to you to receive passing grades in school?

1. Passing is not important to me.
2. Passing is important but other things are more important to me.
3. Passing is very important to me.

APPENDIX C

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ashby, Claire, and Donald Lynch. An Evaluation of ESEA Title I Program "Homework Helpers" District 14. New York: Forham University, 1969.

2. Baratta, Anthony. An Evaluation of the District Nine Homework Helper Program, Title I Project. New York: Fordham University, 1969.

3. Center for Urban Education, Program Reference Service. Homework Helper Program, New York City Program Conspectus. New York, December 1969. (Available from IRCD # UD 009 706)

4. Cloward, Robert D. Studies in Tutoring. New York: Columbia University. Social Work Research Center, 1966. (Available from Columbia University, Source Code #QPX17830; or IRCD, UD 004 462)

5. Cloward, Robert D. Studies in Tutoring. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1967, 36, 1, 14-25.

6. Community Welfare Council. Neighborhood Study Centers in the Sacramento Area. Initial Evaluation and Request for Grant Renewal.

7. Neckritz, Benjamin and George Forlano. Homework Helper Tutorial Assistance Center-School Year 1969-70. N.Y.C. Board of Education, Bureau of Education Research, September 1970.

8. Neckritz, Benjamin and George Forlano. Summer Homework Helper Program, 1970. N.Y.C. Board of Education, Bureau of Educational Research, October, 1970.

9. New York City Board of Education. Fact Sheet - Homework Helper Program. New York: The Board, February 1969.(Available as ERIC Document # ED 020 279).

10. New York City Board of Education, Homework Helper Program Tutorial Assistance Center. The Elementary School Curriculum. N.Y.: The Board, 1967.

11. New York City Board of Education, Homework Helper Program Tutorial Assistance Center. Welcome to Tutoring. New York: The Board, 1969.

12. Smith, James. Evaluation Report -- 1970-71, District 1, Title 1 ESEA, Board of Education, New York City, 1971. (Mimeo.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont'd)

13. Lee M. Joiner. Final Report of the Evaluation of the 1969-70 Homework Helper Program. N.Y. : Teaching & Learning Research Corp., 1970.

14. Lee M. Joiner. Final Report of the Evaluation of the Homework Helper Program. District I. 1971. N.Y.: Teaching & Learning Research Corp., 1971.

15. U. S. Office of Education, Division of Compensatory Education. Homework Helper Program, New York City. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Office of Education, 1969. (A larger study of "exemplary programs," of which this is a part, is available as ERIC document # ED 023 777)

16. Vandetta, Arthur and George Forlano. High School Centers for Homework Helpers: Final Report. N.Y. C. Board of Education, Bureau of Educational Research, July 1970.

Function No. 33-3-1909

VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

EVALUATION STAFF

DIRECTOR: ALAN J. SIMON

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: WALTER L. PEDERSEN

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mrs. Helen Robitzek, Supervisor of Continuing Education District 1, Manhattan; Mr. Thomas Granfield, Administrative Assistant; Mr. Robert Haupt and Mr. Robert Ellis, Teachers-in-Charge; all the teachers and students of the Vacation Day Camp Program

I. Program Description

A. Background

The Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program was established to provide a comprehensive educationally orientated recreation program for the children in grades Kindergarten through 9 in District I, Manhattan. It was especially designed to accomodate children whose families might not otherwise be able to provide safe, professionally supervised recreational activities for the summer months.

B. Scope and Organization

The program was to serve approximately 2,000 public and non-public school children in 12 centers throughout the district. Of these schools two, P.S. #63 and JHS #71, were operated under Title I funds. The scope of this report is, therefore, limited to the program as it functioned in these two centers.

According to the original project proposal, the program was to consist of an educational-recreational format which was to include enrichment activities in music, dance, arts and crafts, sports and physical activities. Four trips both inside and outside New York City were planned with the aim of expanding the horizons of the Vacation Day Camp Children. In addition, the program sought to establish a meaningful link between vacation and school. Instruction was to be provided in oral and written skills so that the children might perform better in school during the regular school year. Snacks and lunches were to be provided each day.

Certain culminating experiences were planned for the end of the program. These included: a softball and basketball tournament, play days, talent shows, swim meets, a district-wide festival and an awards assembly at each school.

C. Supervision and Personnel

The entire VDC program was supervised and administered by the Supervisor of Continuing Education of District I, Manhattan. The personnel allotted for the operation of the two Title I Vacation Day Camps were as follows:

2 Teachers-in-Charge
2 Teacher Specialists
4 Teachers
4 Teacher Aides/Educational Assistants
1 School Secretary

The Teachers-in-Charge at each center were responsible for planning and implementing all phases of the VDC program. His duties included attending to the details of registration, supplies, payroll, attendance and other administrative elements of the program. He was also to coordinate and administer the instructional aspects of the educational program. The two persons assigned to this position were experienced personnel and had served in this capacity at their respective centers in previous VDC programs.

The role of the teaching specialists was to provide culturally enriching experiences for the children in music, dance and arts and crafts. In practice, however, these two positions went to two administrative assistants who worked in the district office in both Title I and non-Title I capacities. The classroom assignments were filled instead with the two tax-levy teachers who were assigned on a part-time basis to VDC 63. VDC 71 was not assigned a teaching specialist.

The teachers assigned to the program were responsible for the instruction of the VDC participants in accordance with the objectives of the program. Two Industrial Arts teachers were assigned to VDC 71 to teach the wood and printing shops. The two teaching positions at VDC 63 were supplemented by two additional tax levy teachers assigned on a full-time basis by the District Office.

The four Educational Assistants were assigned to VDC 63 in order to assist the classroom teachers in the program. In addition, the school employed the services of two student aides who worked in a similar capacity. No ancillary personnel was assigned to VDC 71.

The School Secretary was assigned to the District Office to do clerical and secretarial work. These were supplied by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

1. Discussion of Personnel Assignments

Certain discrepancies would appear to exist between personnel originally allotted for the program and those actually assigned. Though the two administrative assistants served in both Title I and non-Title I capacities, these positions were not part of the program as outlined in the project proposal. Substituting a part-time music and art teacher did not appear to meet the program's needs in these areas. The art teacher worked one day at VDC 63 per week and met only with the girls in the program. The music teacher spent a half of one day at the same center and worked only with the older girls. Neither specialists spent any time at VDC 71 under the rationale that the two shop curriculums would provide an acceptable substitute. As it developed, this was not the case. It would seem clear that the teaching specialists were only reaching a small percentage of eligible VDC participants.

It was also peculiar that all the teacher aides allocated for the program were assigned to VDC 63. The rationale most often given for this condition was that the older children at VDC 71 might resent persons in authority who were their same age. In order to avoid potential conflict it was decided not to assign any assistants to the center. As shown in the next section, most of the students attending VDC 71 were of elementary school age and would not have been the same age as the aides. In addition the teachers at VDC 71 expressed on several different occasions a strong need for educational assistants.

The addition of the tax levy personnel to VDC 63 undoubtedly benefited the operation of the program at this center.

D. Student Date

1. Registration and Attendance

The two VDC centers were originally designed to accomodate 200 students. As part of the evaluative process, attempts were made to collect data which would describe the student population in terms of ethnicity, home, school and daily attendance. This information was made difficult to accurately assess because of certain apparent inaccuracies in the reporting of data by the centers.

Apart from the Vacation Day Camp Program, JHS 71 also contained the activities of the Title I Drug Prevention Day Program and the Emanual Day Care Program. Figures from these programs were routinely reported as part of the VDC attendance data. Thus daily attendance was reported to average

153 participants. In reality, however, daily attendance was much lower. Other information on enrollment per classroom provided by VDC 71 would indicate approximately a total daily attendance of 36 students in both classes. The other 117 students were members of the other two programs and should not have been reported in the Vacation Day Camp attendance statistics.

Census reports in the other center claimed an average daily attendance rate of approximately 104 students in the four classrooms. This would appear to conform with what was observed by the evaluator. But even here student data was possibly misleading. Each school kept what is known as an aggregate register. Under this concept registration is open throughout the whole course of the program. Students may register at anytime. Each registration is recorded by the Teacher-in-Charge and added to the total program registration ledger. Unfortunately, the program is fluid. Many students leave either for camp, vacation or other personal reasons. Their withdrawal is not subtracted from the aggregate register thus artifically inflating the registration statistics.

At VDC 63 average daily registration was reported at 207 students (average attendance 104 students). The program registered initially 167 students. By the last day the aggregate register showed a registration of 223; a gain of 56 students. Actual daily attendance, however, did not vary excessively from the 104 figure and never exceeded 110 students. It might be assumed that actual registration remained fairly stable as well. The situation at VDC 71 showed basically the same pattern but in a much more dramatic way. First day registration was 55 students. By August 15, the aggregate register recorded 230 students; a gain of 175 students. Most of this increase due to the inclusion of the Drug Prevention and Emanual Program.

2. Home School Distribution

Given these inconsistent registration and attendance recording procedures, subsequent data concerning home schools and ethnicity would appear equally inaccurate. They do, however, provide some descriptive information regarding enrollment and are included below with appropriate comments.

TABLE 1

HOME SCHOOL OF STUDENTS ATTENDING TWO VACATION DAY CAMP CENTERS

VDC 63 N=196		VDC 71 N=106	
SCHOOL	NUMBER	SCHOOL	NUMBER
PS 20	4	PS 15	44
63	183	19	1
JHS 104	2	20	10
122	6	34	1
110	1	63	34
NON PUBLIC	0	97	1
		134	3
		140	1
		NON PUBLIC	11

These figures were collected in the second week of the program and are based on student registration data. It is believed that the figures reported by VDC 63 are more accurate than those at VDC 71. The highest registration figure ever recorded by the two VDC classes at 71 was 59, well below the 106 figure cited here.

Over 90% of the students at VDC 63 were students there during the winter. It is peculiar that VDC reported no students who attended that school during the regular school year. It might be assumed from this information that: 1) no students from JHS 71 attended the Vacation Day Camp Program at this center and thus the program was not serving the students for whom it was originally intended or; 2) JHS 71 students were attending but were not included in the data. In this case the program was not accurately recording student registration.

During the regular school year, JHS 71 has a school population of approximately 1,250 students. The fact that the Vacation Day Camp included none of these students, for whatever reasons, among its register is most disconcerting. While some students may have elected to enroll in the Drug program (total enrollment 32), it could not have been enough to account for the absence of so many eligible students. Where these students are and how to induce them into attending the VDC program ought, it would seem, be one of the program's major tasks.

In order to pursue this question, a distribution by grade level of students considered enrolled in the program was obtained. This was taken on the third week of the program. A list was provided for 148 students, well above the number of students actually observed in the program. The distribution is provided below:

TABLE 2

GRADE LEVEL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ATTENDING VDC 71

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER N=148
fourth	14
fifth	34
sixth	46
seventh	17
eighth	7
ninth	6
Senior High	24

If one can accept the validity of these figures, it would appear that a large proportion of the students accounted for were of elementary school age. Only 30 were of junior high school age. Twenty-four were listed as high school students. Given that most of these students were technically enrolled in the Drug Prevention and Emanual programs, it is clear that the program was not enrolling the students for which the program was originally intended.

3. Sex Distribution

Of the 196 students registered at VDC 63, 108 were boys (55%) and 88 were girls (45%). The program was designed to accomodate and appeared to provide appropriate activities for a balanced number of boys and girls.

There were no girls registered at VDC 71. This might in large part be attributed to the manner in which the program was structured. In offering wood and printing shops as the basic classroom curriculum, the program was decidedly orientated toward activities which would be most favored by boys. Some girls (approximately 22) were enrolled in the Drug Prevention Program but this cannot be considered as sufficient enough to handle the large number of eligible female students. It was never made clear why the program had been structured in this manner. Clearly if the program is to serve the student population for which it was intended, revisions in the program most certainly ought to be made to accomodate girl students.

4. Ethnic Distribution

Each center was asked to submit student ethnic data during the second week of the program. These figures were compared to the ethnic distribution of the center during the regular school year.* As before it was felt that data supplied by VDC 63 was more accurate than that submitted by VDC 71. The 148 figure from which the VDC 71 information was based is highly inflated. Allowing for these inaccuracies, the data has some utility in allowing estimates of ethnic representation at each center.

TABLE 3

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF EACH VDC CENTER AS COMPARED TO REGULAR SCHOOL DISTRIBUTION

	VDC 63	N 196	71	N 148
	Summer VDC	School year	Summer VDC	School year
BLACK	13%	9%	33%	12.4%
P. R. & Spanish	44%	64.5%	45%	77.8%
Oriental	28%	10%	16%	4.8%
Other	15%	16.5%	6%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

It would appear from these statistics that Oriental students attended the VDC in greater proportion than their numbers would suggest during the regular school year. Also Black students tended to enroll in VDC more than their regular school percentage rate. Spanish and Puerto Rican students appear under represented in the Vacation Day Camp as compared to their regular school figures.

5. Discussion of Student Data

It would appear that the program experienced some difficulty in accounting for the students it was to serve. VDC 63 was successful in providing a structure suitable for elementary school boys and girls. Unfortunately, the concept of aggregate register tended to over inflate the number of students registered in the program at any one time.

*Information obtained from a census of ethnic composistion for District 1, Manhattan taken by the Board of Education of the City of New York in September 1971 and revised in January 1972.

This was also true for VDC 71. These errors might be corrected by the taking of actual attendance by name during the day rather than simply "counting heads" in the morning as was the procedure.

VDC 71 had quite some difficulty discerning those students in the school who were in fact members of the program. Though the program was intended to provide appropriate activities for boys and girls of junior high school age, it enrolled a very small number of junior high students and no girls. This program did not seem to adequately enroll the students for which it was originally designed. Improvements might be made by offering more activities for girls and by instituting more controls over registration and attendance accounting procedures.

II. Program Objectives:

As stated in the original proposal, the Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program was to be an education-recreational program serving the students grades K-9 to District 1, Manhattan. Among the activities to be provided were: arts and crafts, music, dance, sports and athletics. In addition formal instruction was to be provided in oral and written skills. The major goals of the program were: (1) To provide a meaningful link between vacation and school so that the Day Camp participants would show an improved attitude in school for the new year. (2) To stimulate parent involvement in the program so that the children would be rated by their parents as being more interested in school. (3) To improve oral and written skills so that Day Camp participants would be able to perform better academically in school during the school year.

III. Evaluation Objectives:

The formal evaluation objectives of the Vacation Day Camp Enrichment Program were as follows:

1. To determine the extent and scope of the activities provided by the program in the areas of arts and crafts, music, dance, sports and athletics.

2. To determine whether 70% of the Day Camp participants improved in their attitudes toward school.

3. To determine whether 60% of the children were rated by their parents as being more interested in school.

4. To determine whether 60% of the children improved in their oral and written skills.

IV. Methods and Procedures

1. In order to determine the scope of the activities provided by the program, a process evaluation relaying on site visits, observations, and conversations with personnel and students was used. Information gained in this manner was used to describe the program, form conclusions, and offer recommendations wherever appropriate.

2. Student attitudes toward school were determined by using the "My School" questionnaire. During the first five days of the program all students among the older girls and boys groups at VDC 63 and all the students enrolled in the two VDC classes at JHS 71 were administered

questionnaires. A list was provided to both schools so that those students submitting initial questionnaires could be surveyed again at the end of the program. This was done at both schools. Mean scores were analyzed using a correlated "t" test of significance. In addition a frequency analysis to determine 70% positive change was used.

3. The parents of the student sample described above were used to determine parental perceptions. A pre-program questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the program. During the last week of the program a list of those parents submitting initial questionnaires was given both centers. A post-program questionnaire was then submitted to these parents. The results were then treated using a correlated "t" test of significance. In addition a frequency analysis to determine 60% positive change was used.

4. To determine the extent of change in academic skills, 40 students from the program were randomly selected. Each student was rated by his teacher on an "Oral Language Skills Evaluation" checklist. In addition each student wrote a composition on one of four previously selected topics. These were scored by the evaluation team using a "Written Language Skills Evaluation" checklist. The scores from these two areas were summated. At the end of the program each center was given a list of those students to retest in these areas. Unfortunately only VDC 63 was able to return the required information. Therefore the results reflect only student academic performance at one center.

V. Findings

A. Process Evaluation

The Vacation Day Came Program was originally intended to consist of an educational-recreational format which was to include activities in the following areas: arts and crafts, sports and physical activities, trips, music, drama and dance. As a result of these activities students were to show improvement in their attitudes toward school and in their academic ability in oral and written skills. Parents were to indicate an awareness of their child's improved attitudes toward school. Each of these aspects is discussed below in terms of funding, organization and overall effectiveness.

1. Arts and Crafts

A total of $300 was allocated to the program for the purchasing of instructional supplies. Of this amount, $100 was set aside for arts and crafts supplies and $200 was budgeted for supplies for the two shops at VDC 71.

The program at VDC 63 appeared well organized and adequately supplied. Each class (particularly among the two girls classes) carried on an arts and crafts program as a regular part of the classroom activities. The girls' program was further supplemented by additional instruction from the arts and crafts specialist one day per week. Each room was decorated with childrens' work and a small exhibit was setup in the school consisting of children's work at the end of the program.

In contrast the program at VDC 71 was beset by many problems from the beginning and did not materialize in the manner expected.

Organizationally, the program was biased against girls since they could not enroll in the printing and wood shops. Unlike VDC 63 no

provision was made to supplement the shop programs with either of the teaching specialists. Hence the girls, who had to enroll in the Drug Prevention Program, were not provided with arts and crafts facilities.

In terms of materials the program was poorly supplied. The wood shop used a very small supply of materials left over from the regular school year for the first few weeks of the program. When finally materials were made available during the third week, the small amount and the limited time remaining proved insufficient to meet the needs of the program.

The printing shop never in fact got organized. For the first few weeks of the program, the teacher was not able to even enter the room since the door had been double locked by the regular school year principal. The necessary keys were not made available until rather late in the program. Once entry had been made it was found that much of the necessary equipment needed to operate the shop had been removed from the room and locked away. Supplies for the program were not delivered until the fourth week of the program. As a result the printing shop went unused the whole summer.

As the program was originally structured each shop was to operate three hours per day three days per week. It was clear to the observer that the program failed to meet this time schedule. The effects of this disorganization and lack of supplies on the students were for the most part negative (cf. student findings). Students, who presumably had an interest in either wood or print shops, were denied the satisfying or creative experiences they had a right to expect. Obviously future VDC programs at JHS 71 ought to concentrate on avoiding many of these problems.

2. Sports and Physical Activities

An allottment of $200 was made to purchase materials for sports and physical activities programs.

The program at VDC 63 appeared well organized and adequately equipped. The observer noted a variety of indoor and outdoor recreational activities which seemed to meet the interests and needs of the students.

The outdoor program consisted of many of the activities generally associated with the more typical playground programs. These included softball, basketball, handball, swimming and kickball. The program was highlighted by tournaments between the other Vacation Day Camps and a district wide play day featuring games and contests. The indoor program concentrated on low competitive; more relaxing games of chess, checkers, and knock hockey.

The recreational program at VDC 71 was poorly equipped and functioned at a very minimal level. It was originally intended that the two classes would occupy the gym or game room three hours per day four days per week. Unfortunately lack of athletic equipment obviated much of this time schedule.

It was claimed by the personnel at VDC 71 that the program at this school had not been supplied with any recreational equipment. The program was forced to function on a bumper pool, ping pong table and volleyball obtained from other schools; and three basketballs borrowed from the Drug Prevention Program. These limited facilities, it was felt, greatly curtailed the operation of the athletic program. In fact except

for when the gym was used for the Drug Prevention Program, it remained locked most of the time.

In addition to the shop programs which never materialized, the students in VDC 71 were forced to participate in an extremely limited athletic program. Future VDC programs in this center ought to concentrate in providing the necessary equipment needed to a legitimate sports and recreational program.

3. Trips

In order to expand the horizons of the VDC students, four bus trips both inside and outside New York City were planned. Of these, three were assigned to VDC 63 while VDC 71 was allotted one. It was felt by the VDC supervisors that the types of trips scheduled would be more appropriate for the younger children at VDC 63. The schedule for the four prescribed trips were as follows:

TABLE 4

Scheduled Bus Trips for the Two VDC Centers

VDC 63		VDC 71	
July 20	Bear Mountain State Park	July 19	Bear Mountain State Park
July 27	Bronx Zoo		
August 4	Richmond Restoration and Barrett Park Zoo		

In addition to the scheduled trips, each center took a good number of local "subway" trips. These totaled about six to eight for each center.

4. Music, Dance and Drama

The original proposal called for teaching specialists to enrich the cultural and educational experiences of the children in music, dance, drama and arts and crafts. In addition to the art teacher already discussed, a music teacher was hired for the program.

It would appear that the music teacher was engaged on a much more limited basis than had originally beeen intended. She worked one half day per week with the group of older girls at VDC 63. She was not assigned at all to VDC 71.

It was generally felt by the administration of the VDC that the music specialist offered services which would be most appreciated by the girl students. Therefore it was decided that the boys would not receive instruction in this area.

The program worked in conjunction with the classroom activities. The girls were taught basic songs and dances and practiced them with the classroom teacher during the week. The program was highlighted by a brief music presentation presented by the older girls to the Day Camp.

The evaluator did not observe a drama component to the cultural arts program of the Vacation Day Camp.

B. Student Attitudes

One of the most fundamental objectives of the Vacation Day Camp program was to foster positive change in the attitudes of the students toward school. Student attitudes were assessed from the results of the "My School Questionnaire" (Appendix A).

During the first five days of the program 100 questionnaires were distributed to both VDC centers. This represented approximately all the students in the older boys and girls at VDC 63 and all the students at VDC 71. Of these, 80 initial questionnaires were returned; 50 from VDC 63 and 30 from VDC 71. During the last week of the program a list of all the students submitting initial questionnaires was given to each center so that collecting post scores would be made easier. Of these VDC 63 returned 27 questionnaires and VDC 25. A total of 52 pre-post scores surveying student attitudes was obtained.

An analysis of the findings is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

't' test - "My School Questionnaire" Pre-Post Differences

	MEAN	SD		N=52
pre	41.423	6.906	t = .123	
post	41.269	5.314	n.s.	

The results would indicate that no significant differences were found between the pre and post scores of the "My School Questionnaire." We might conclude that participation in the Vacation Day Camp Program did not have a large effect on the students attitudes toward school.

These results were reported for the whole program as it operated in both centers. Given the many negative aspects of the program at one center, separate 't' tests for each center were conducted. The results are reported below in Table 6 and 7.

TABLE 6

't' test - "My School Questionnaire' at VDC 3 - Pre-Post Difference

N=27

	MEAN	SD	
pre	40.333	5.378	t = 2.416*
post	43.834	3.707	

*P < .05

TABLE 7

't' test - "My School Questionnaire" at VDC 71 Pre-Post Differences

N=25

	MEAN	SD	
Pre	42.28	5.160	
			t = 1.061*
			n.s.
Post	39.88	9.038	

These separate analyzes indicate a significant positive change of attitudes toward school on the part of the participants at VDC 63. The results from VDC 71 signify change in a negative direction. It would appear from these results that the participants at VDC 71 ended the program with less favorable attitudes toward school than they had at the beginning of the Day Camp sessions.

It would appear that VDC 63 was able to meet the program objectives but that VDC 71 was not.

C. Parent Attitudes

Questionnaires were submitted to the parents of the Vacation Day Camp children at the beginning and during the last week of the program. These questionnaires were designed to elicit parental perceptions of their children's attitudes toward school before and after attending the Vacation Day Camp. In addition to the original questions, the second questionnaire also contained several questions designed to determine how well parents felt their children enjoyed aspects of the Vacation Day Camp program.

During the first five days of the program 100 preliminary questionnaires were submitted to the children of both centers receiving the "My School Questionnaire." Of these, 72 were returned; 40 from VDC 63 and 32 from VDC 71. During the last week of the program lists of the names of the parents submitting the first questionnaire were given to each center. Of these names, 42 returned post questionnaires; 23 from VDC 23 and 19 from VDC 71. The results from these questionnaires are reported below.

TABLE 8

't' test - Parents Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School

Pre-Post Differences

N=42

	MEAN	SD	
Pre	21.092	4.465	
			t = 1.868*
Post	20.073	4.076	

*P < .05

The results would indicate that parental assessments of their children's attitudes toward school were lower at the end of the program than at the beginning. A frequency analysis reveals that 13 out of the 42 parents returning pre-post scores indicate a positive change. This was approximately 30% -- well below the 60% level set for the program.

As with the student questionnaires, it was felt that the program at VDC 71 might have unduly influenced these results downward. Therefore, separate analyzes for each center was computed. The results are reported below in Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 9

't' Test - Parent Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School at VDC 63

	MEAN	SD	Pre-Post Differences N = 23
PRE	20.434	4.775	t = .441*
POST	20.695	4.303	

*P $\lesssim$ .05 $\approx$ .396

TABLE 10

't' Test - Parent Assessment of Children's Attitudes Toward School at VDC 71

	MEAN	SD	Pre-Post Differences N = 19*
PRE	21.736	3.124	t = 2.058*
POST	19.842	3.113	

*P $\lesssim$ .05 $\approx$ .433

The results from these separate analyzes would indicate that the parental assessment at VDC 63 was higher at the end of the program than at the beginning. The results from VDC 71 indicate that parental assessments were significantly lower at the end of the program than at the beginning. We might conclude that VDC 63 was able to meet the program objectives set for this area but that VDC 71 was not.

D. Parental Perceptions of Aspects of the Vacation Day Camp Program

The first six questions of the second parent questionnaire were designed to gain reactions toward different aspects of the Vacation Day Camp Program (Appendix C). The yes responses from these questions have been summarized in Table 11 below. The Table compares the results for each question for each center. The results indicate that the program at VDC 63 was perceived by the parents in a more positive way than the program at VDC 71.

TABLE 11

Parent Responses to Different Aspects of the VDC for Each Center -- Yes Responses

Question	VDC 63 N=23	VDC 71 N=19
1. Did your child look forward to going to Vacation Day Camp each Day?	89%	78%
2. Did your child like the things he made in arts and crafts?	75%	65%
3. Did your child learn to use new and difference materials in the Arts and Crafts Program?	71%	63%
4. Did your child seem to enjoy the special trips he went on in the Vacation Day Camp?	100%	88%
5. Did your child talk at home about the things he may have learned from the trips?	89%	57%
6. Did your child learn any new games at Vacation Day Camp?	54%	57%

E. Academic Skills

In addition to the recreational activities, the Vacation Day Camp was to provide formal instruction in written and oral skills. The instruction was to focus around the planned trips provided by the Day Camp.

Prior to the trip there was to be a discussion of why a trip was to be taken and what might be learned from it. From these discussions a determination was to be made by the teacher concerning speech patterns, voice control, grammar and general clarity. After the trip was completed additional time was to be spent in oral discussion with a view toward evaluating the same oral objectives.

Written skills instruction was to follow the same general pattern. Time was spent writing stories about the trip. These stories were to be corrected by the teacher, and returned to the student with appropriate comments for improvement.

The program at VDC 63 tended to adhere to these instructional objectives. Time was formally allotted for instruction in these areas. Unfortunately the program at VDC 71 failed to follow these guidelines. The personnel assigned to the program were not aware of these academic objectives at the beginning of the program. When appraised of these criteria, they were unable, it seems,to structure their program to include these instructional activities. Consequently, no instruction in either oral or written skills was provided the students. Therefore, no information from this center was obtained. Our analyzes are limited to the results obtained from VDC 63.

It was originally intended that 40 students (20 from each center) would be randomly selected for evaluation. The problems associated with VDC 71 reduced this sample to the 20 students from VDC 63. The results from this center are provided below:

TABLE 12

Oral and Written Skills Evaluation for VDC 63 - Pre and Post Measures

N = 20

	MEAN	SD	
PRE	27.333	4.767	t = 4.534*
POST	29.809	3.627	
	*P .05	.413	

The results indicate that post scores were significantly higher at the end of the program than at the beginning. We might conclude that this center was able to successfully teach academic skills in a primarily recreational setting.

VI. Conclusions

A. Process Evaluation

Certain disparities appeared to exist between the resources allocated to VDC 63 and those allocated to VDC 71. These inequities were found primarily in the areas of personnel, supplies, trips and types of activities offered. As a consequence the program at VDC 63 appeared well organized, adequately staffed, and well supplied. It offered a well rounded program for both boys and girls and appeared to meet all the program objectives. Conversely, the program at VDC 71 was so poorly supplied and inadequately staffed that it failed to meet any of the program objectives set for it.

B. Student Attitudes

The students at VDC 63 appeared to have a more positive attitude toward school at the end of the Vacation Day Camp than before. The students at VDC 71 indicated less positive attitudes toward school at the end of the program than they had at the beginning of the program. These results, we feel, were the relative merits of the activities provided by each program.

C. Parent Attitudes

Parental assessment of their children's attitudes toward school were more favorable at the end of the program at VDC 63 than before the program. The parents at VDC 71 indicated significantly less favorable attitudes toward school on the part of their children. It would appear that the childred at VDC 71 were communicating a good deal of their dissatisfaction with the program to their parents.

In addition the parents at VDC 63 indicated greater satisfaction with the different aspects of the program than did those parents at VDC 71.

D. Academic Skills

The program at VDC 71 was so disorganized that it found it impossible to include an educational component into its activities. The program at VDC 63 included instructional activities as a part of its on-going program. The results indicate that the students in this center improved their oral and written skills to a significant degree over the course of the five week program.

VII. Recommendations

School District 1. Manhattan encompasses one of the more severely deprived socio-economic areas in New York City. Programs such as the Vacation Day Camp when, effectively administered, can help to expand the horizons of the children of this area by providing a series of enriching and rewarding experiences. It would appear that the program at VDC 63 was able to effectively meet these challenges and it is therefore recommended that the program at this center be recycled. However the program at VDC 71 was beset by so many organizational and administrative problems that its impact on the community was felt to be negligible. Therefore, we can recommend the recycling of the VDC program at this center only if strict adherence is made to the recommendations listed below.

1. Personnel: There seems to have been some disparity in the personnel scheduled for the program and those actually assigned. It is therefore recommended that all personnel assigned to the program be used on a full time basis in the manner originally set forth for the program. It is further recommended that the personnel (including teachers, teaching specialists, and paraprofessionals) ultimately assigned be distributed in a fair and equal manner to each center.

2. Resources: There seems to have been some disparity in the manner in which materials and instructional supplies assigned to the program were distributed. It is therefore recommended that the amount of supplies allotted to the program be divided in a fair and equal fashion. In particular VDC 71 should be supplied with appropriate amounts of arts and crafts and athletic materials.

3. Organization: The program at VDC 71 should be structured to provide rewarding and enriching experiences for girl students. In particular the services of the arts and crafts and music specialists ought to be made available to the school. In addition a home class for girls ought to be incorporated into the program. It is also recommended that the wood and print shops be maintained but that they be adequately supplied and ready to use at the beginning of the program.

4. Trips: Given the positive way in which the trips appeared to be received by the students and the seeming beneficial effects they had as motivation for instruction, it is recommended that the present number of planned trips for the program be increased from the present number of four to at least six. In addition, given the inequities in the amount of trips allotted this past year to each center, it is further recommended that trip assignments be allotted in a fair and equal fashion.

5. Student Attendance: Given the small number of eligible junior high school students to attend the program at VDC 71, it is recommended that serious efforts be made to induce eligible students to attend. It is further recommended that attendance collection at each center include only those students officially registered for the program. Students from other programs in the building should not be included. Finally it is recommended that the aggregate register method of counting students in the program be modified so that students no longer in the program be eliminated from the register.

6. Educational Component: Given the positive change in oral and written skills recorded by the students at VDC 63, it is recommended that the educational component of the VDC program be continued. It is strongly recommended that the program at VDC 71 institute this component as a significant aspect of their program.

APPENDIX A

VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

"MY SCHOOL" QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHING & LEARNING

Name _____ Class _____

School _____

We would like you to find out how you feel about your school. Here are some things that some boys and girls say about their school. Are these things true about your school? If they are very true for your school, circle the big "YES!" If they are true some of the time, but not all of the time, circle the little "yes." If they are mostly not true, circle the little "no". If they are not at all true, circle the big "NO!"

1.	The teachers in this school want to help you.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
2.	The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
3.	The teachers in this school are really interested in you.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
4.	The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
5.	The teachers in this school are fair and square.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
6.	The boys and girls in this school fight too much.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
7.	This school building is a pleasant place.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
8.	The principal in this school is friendly.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
9.	The work at this school is too hard.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
10.	What I am learning will be useful to me.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
11.	The trip to and from school is too long.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
12.	I wish I didn't have to go to school at all.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
13.	This is the best school I know.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
14.	The work at this school is too easy.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
15.	I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere.	YES!	yes	no	NO!
16.	I've learned more this year than any earlier year.	YES!	yes	no	NO!

APPENDIX B VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE #1

Your Name_____

Child's Name_____

Child's Age_____Child's Date of Birth_____

Last Year's School Grade_____

Name of Day Camp Center_____

DIRECTIONS: Your child is attending Vacation Day Camp this summer. We would like to find out how you think your child will feel about school this coming year.

Please read each question carefully. If you think the question is true for you circle the YES answer. If you feel the question is not true for you circle the NO. If you are not sure how you feel about the question circle NOT SURE.

Kindly return the completed questionnaire to the Vacation Day Camp Center with your child as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

- -

1. Do you think that after attending VACATION DAY CAMP, your child will enjoy school more this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

2. Do you think that after attending VACATION DAY CAMP, your child will be absent from school less this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

3. After attending VACATION DAY CAMP, do you think your child will see school as a better place to be than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

4. Do you think your child will get along better with his classmates this year after attending VACATION DAY CAMP than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

5. Do you think that after attending VACATION DAY CAMP, your child will be late for school less this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

6. After attending VACATION DAY CAMP, do you think that your child will try to do better in his or her school work than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

7. After attending VACATION DAY CAMP, do you think your child will get into trouble less this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

8. Do you think that after attending VACATION DAY CAMP your child will complete his homework assignments more this year than in the past?

YES NO NOT SURE

PARENTS QUESTIONNAIRE #2

Your Name_____

Child's Name_____

Child's Age_____Child's Date of Birth_____

Last Year's School Grade_____

Name of Day Camp Center_____

DIRECTIONS: Your child has been attending Vacation Day Camp this summer. We would like to find out how you think your child felt about the program and how he might feel about school this coming year.

Please read each question carefully. If you think the question is true for you circle the YES answer. If you feel the question is not true for you circle the NO. If you are not sure how you feel about the question circle NOT SURE.

Kindly return the completed questionnaire to the Vacation Day Camp Center with your child as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. Did your child look forward to going to Vacation Day Camp each day?

YES NO NOT SURE

2. Did your child seem to like the things he made in Arts and Crafts?

YES NO NOT SURE

3. Did your child learn how to use new and different materials in the Arts and Crafts Program?

YES NO NOT SURE

4. Did your child seem to enjoy the special trips he went on in the Vacation Day Camp?

YES NO NOT SURE

5. Did your child talk at home about any of the things he may have learned from the trips?

YES NO NOT SURE

6. Did your child learn any new games at Vacation Day Camp?

YES NO NOT SURE

VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

PARENTS QUESTIONNAIRE #2 (continued)

7. Having attended Vacation Day Camp, do you think your child will enjoy school more this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

8. Do you think that after attending Vacation Day Camp, your child will be absent from school less this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

9. After attending Vacation Day Camp this past summer, do you think your child will see school as a better place to be in than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

10. Now that your child has attended Vacation Day Camp, do you think he will get along better with his classmates this year than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

11. Do you think that your child will be late less for school next year now that he has attended Vacation Day Camp?

YES NO NOT SURE

12. After attending Vacation Day Camp, do you think that your child will try to do better in his school work than in past years?

YES NO NOT SURE

13. Do you think your child will get into trouble less in school now that he has attended Vacation Day Camp this past summer?

YES NO NOT SURE

14. Do you think that after attending Vacation Day Camp, your child will complete his homework assignment more this year than in the past?

YES NO NOT SURE

APPENDIX D VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Oral Language Skills Evaluation
(will be used as pre and post assessment)

Instructions

All children participating in the program are to listed according to the alphabetical order of their last names. Check every fifth student on this list. During the first week of the program evaluate the oral language skills of the students checked using the following.

INSTRUCTIONAL AREA	NEED INTENSIVE WORK	NEEDS SOME ATTENTION	NEEDS MINIMAL INSTRUCTION
1. Willingness to participate in oral discussion	_____	_____	_____
2. Ability to "stay on the topic" when speaking	_____	_____	_____
3. Can be heard by group when speaking	_____	_____	_____
4. Avoids overuse of "filler" words such as: "you know," "right," "a-a," "uhh"	_____	_____	_____
5. Speaking directly to listeners	_____	_____	_____
6. Avoids covering face when speaking	_____	_____	_____
7. Avoids over-reliance on trite objectives such as: "jar-out," "nice," "great"	_____	_____	_____
8. Speaking at appropriate speed	_____	_____	_____
9. Uttering several related sentences on same topic	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX E VACATION DAY CAMP ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH

Written Language Skills Evaluation

During the first week of the program all students in grades four through nine will be required to spend 45 minutes writing an essay. Any of the following topics may be used:

My Best Friend
The Funniest Thing I've Ever Seen
My Favorite Movie
My Neighborhood

Their essays will be submitted to TLRC.

In the final week, the students will again write essays on the above topics. They will, however, be instructed to select a different topic than the one they originally wrote on. They will also be submitted to TLRC.

A random sample of 40 with pre and post essays will be selected. These essays will be coded A or B, in some cases A referring to pre and in the remainder B referring to post. The actual identification (pre or post) will be recorded by TLRC and will not be available to the teachers.

The sample of essays will be returned (in pairs) to the teachers and they will be asked to grade them according to the following format:

Student's Name _____ Essay "A" Essay "B"

Criteria	Check if poor*	
1. Spelling	_____	_____
2. Capitalization	_____	_____
3. Legibility of handwriting	_____	_____
4. Punctuation	_____	_____
5. Complete sentence	_____	_____
6. Related sentences follow one another	_____	_____
7. Use of paragraphs	_____	_____
8. Use of detail	_____	_____
9. Varies sentence structure	_____	_____
10. Grammar	_____	_____

Please indicate which of the essays you would consider best: A or B.

Analysis: The relative f of pre and post essays identified as showing deficiencies in each of the areas will be examined. If the program is having an impact, fewer gross errors should be noted for the post essays. At the general level, teachers rate post essays as superior if the program is effective in improving written language. Fisher's exact probabilities test will be used in the statistical analysis.

* The term poor refers to cases where error is very common and would seem to warrant intensive remedial work.